CRIMINOLOGY LIBRARY
UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO
D
3 1761 00426491 1

HV
5309
05G5
v. 17

CRIM.

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2017 with funding from
University of Toronto

https://archive.org/details/chronicdrunkenne17giff

Project 52

SUBSTUDY 1 - 17&11&16&S - 66

FIRST OFFENDERS: A COMPARISON

THE CHRONIC DRUNKENNESS OFFENDER

Chapter XVII

Confidential - Not for Publication

This manuscript comprises unpublished material. Please do not quote from it or use it in any way without written permission from the Foundation.

Alcoholism and Drug Addiction
Research Foundation,
24 Harbord Street,
Toronto, Ontario.

Project 52

SUBSTUDY 1-17&11&16&S-66

FIRST OFFENDERS: A COMPARISON

THE CHRONIC DRUNKENNESS OFFENDER

Chapter XVII

Confidential - Not for Publication

This manuscript comprises unpublished material, Please do not quote from it or use it in any way without written permission from the Foundation.

Alcoholism and Drug Addiction
Research Foundation,
24 Harbord Street,
Toronto, Ontario.

HV
5309
O5G5
v.17

CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION	1
METHOD	3
THE ARREST	11
Degree of Intoxication Prior to Arrest Physical Drinking Environment Evidence of Intoxication Precipitating Arrest Social Drinking Environment Socio-Economic Status and Public Drunkenness Arrests	
CONSTRUCTION OF A PREDICTIVE MODEL	40
Problem (or Addictive) Drinking Social Isolation Socio-Economic Vulnerability Integration into Skid Row Society Age and First Offence	
PREDICTIONS, VALIDATION AND RECONSIDERATIONS	98
Verifying the Predictions An Alternative Approach Reconsiderations	
APPENDIX	118
The Short Form Prediction Model	

TABLES

Table		Page
XVII-1	Final Disposition of Original Sample	3
XVII-2	Number of Hours Spent Drinking Prior to Arrest	11
XVII-3	Blood Alcohol Level of First Offenders at Time of Arrest	13
XVII-4	Food Intake During Drinking Period (i.e. within 5 hours prior to arrest)	14
XVII-5	Terminal Drinking Place Prior to Arrest	15
XVII-6	Distance of Terminal Drinking Place from Home	16
XVII-7	Number of Miles from Home when Arrested	17
XVII-8	Per Cent of Distance between Terminal Drinking Place and Destination before being Arrested	17
XVII-9	Intended Destination Prior to Arrest	18
XVII-10	Distance of Respondent's Home from Downtown Toronto	19
XVII-11	Distance of Terminal Drinking Place from Downtown Toronto	20
XVII-12	Distance of the Location of the Arrest from Downtown Toronto	20
XVII-13	Respondent's Means of Travel	21
XVII-14	Unusual Behaviour or Circumstances Prior to Arrest	22
XVII-15	Unusual Behaviour or Circumstances Prior to Arrest, by Distance from Downtown Toronto	23
XVII-16	Unusual Behaviour or Circumstances Prior to Arrest, by Blood Alcohol Level of Respondent	24
XVII-17	Unusual Behaviour or Circumstances Prior to Arrest, by Respondent's Customary Drinking Type	26
XVII-18	Unusual Behaviour or Circumstances Prior to Arrest, by Customary Drinking Type and Extent of Intoxication	26

Table		Page
XVII-19	Drinking Company at Terminal Drinking Place	32
XVII-20	Respondent's Company when Arrested	33
XVII-21	History of Problem Drinking Symptoms	43
XVII-22	History of Four Symptoms of Problem Drinking	44
XVII-23	Present Symptoms of Problem Drinking. a) Ability to control amount consumed at a sitting b) Spree-drinking in past year c) Amount of absolute alcohol consumed daily	46
XVII-24	Proportion of First Offenders at Present Reporting Controlled Drinking and No Sprees who have Experienced Problem Drinking Symptoms	47
XVII-25	Change in Drinking Habits over Last Few Years, by Age	49
XVII-26	Self-Evaluation of Drinking Type. a) By Age b) By Present Problem Drinking Symptoms c) By History of Problem Drinking Symptoms d) By Degree of Addiction and Marital Status e) By Degree of Addiction and Birthplace f) By Degree of Addiction and Customary Drinking Companions	51-54
XVII-27	Marital Status of First Offenders, C.D.O.s and Toronto Male Population	55
XVII-28	Marital Status, with First Offenders Grouped by Age	55
XVII-29	Reasons for Never Marrying	56
XVII-30	Causes of Marital Break-up	56
XVII-31	Frequency of Contact with Relatives	57
XVII-32	Frequency of Contact with Children	57

Table		Page
XVII-33	Place of Birth	58
XVII-34	Country of Birth	58
XVII-35	Friendship Relations	59
XVII-36	Frequency of Contact with Close Friends	60
XVII-37	Type of Area where Youth is Spent	61
XVII-38	Length of Residence in Toronto	62
XVII-39	Educational Attainment	64
XVII-40	Occupational Status a) Present Occupational Status b) Highest Occupational Status Ever	65
XVII-41	Occupational Mobility	66
XVII-42	Father's Occupational Status	67
XVII-43	Occupational Stability	68
XVII-44	Indices of Economic Stability	69
XVII-45	Residence a) Residential Address b) Type of Residence	72
XVII-46	Spare-Time Activities	74
XVII-47	Characteristics of Leisure Activities	76
XVII-48	Customary Beverages Consumed	77
XVII-49	Customary Drinking Place	78
XVII-50	Customary Drinking Companions	79
XVII-51	Incorrigibility of C.D.O.s after Last Release from Jail	80
XVII-52	Changes in Behaviour Planned as a Result of This Arrest	81
XVII-53	Incorrigibility of First Offenders a) By Marital Status b) By Residence c) By Employment Status d) By Occupational Status e) By Kinship Relations f) By Country of Origin g) By Legitimation of the Legal Processes Administering Public Drunkenness Offenders h) By Disapproval of the Legal Agencies Dealing with Public Drunkenness Offenders	82-83
XVII-54	Attitudes Towards Police Treatment	89
XVII-55	Attitudes Towards Court Treatment	90
XVII-56	Attitudes Towards Treatment by Jail Authorities	90
XVII-57	Legitimation of Legal Processes, by Degree of Social Integration a) By Marital Status b) By Kinship Relations c) By Country of Origin d) By Customary Drinking Companions	91-92

Table		Page
XVII-58	Convictions for Criminal Offences	93
XVII-59	Age Distribution of Drunkenness Offenders	95
XVII-60	Individual Vulnerability Ratings	99-101
XVII-61	The Prediction Groups: A Typology	102
XVII-62	Additional Drunkenness Offences by the First Offenders since First Drunkenness Offence	105
XVII-63	Age at Time of First Drunkenness Offence	107
XVII-64	Problem Drinking History at Time of First Drunkenness Arrest	109
XVII-65	Marital Status at Time of First Drunkenness Arrest	110
XVII-66	Occupational Status at Time of First Drunkenness Arrest	111

CHAPTER XVII

THE FIRST OFFENDER STUDY

INTRODUCTION

The idea of a first offender study was conceived as a result of certain questions which our study of the chronic drunkenness offender posed but could not itself answer satisfactorily. For example, there were such questions as "What types of people are recruited into the ranks of the C.D.O.?" and "What are the processes by which they are recruited?" or "What social characteristics or personality types predispose some individuals and not others to recruitment?". Although an attempt was made to have a full account of the life histories of the chronic drunkenness offenders in order to map out the common order of events proceeding from first drunkenness arrest to chronic arrest and Skid Row citizenship, the C.D.O. subjects were for the most part too much conditioned or more resigned to their way of life to offer many objective insights. Often their own accounts were not better than blurred and incomplete recollections.

It is therefore of great importance, in order to gain the most complete picture of the chronic drunkenness offender recruitment process, to study that population of potential recruits or 'candidates', - the first offenders. Particular emphasis is placed on their present social characteristics and social vulnerabilities. Particular attention is paid to the circumstances of their arrest, and to the probabilities that these first offenders will come to be arrested again and again, eventually becoming full-fledged C.D.O.s. The first offender group is the pool of potential recruits from which all C.D.O.s are drawn, and our present interest is more one of finding a means of predicting recruitment than specifying the processes by which gradual recruitment takes place.

A first offender, while theoretically one who has never been charged with an offence prior to its present occurrence, is defined for the purposes of this study as one who has not had a conviction for public drunkenness in Toronto within the last 5 years. In fact, two first offenders in our sample have had prior arrests for this offence more than 5 years ago; another 13 have been charged with other drink-associated offences prior to their present arrest but have never before been charged with public drunkenness. While these prior arrests may have a contaminating effect on the findings of this study, it is difficult to estimate

the direction or extent of the bias. It is also possible that if such a bias were introduced by such previous arrests it would wash out with time. Therefore we operate on the assumption that our sample is a relatively pure one in this respect.

At the same time, another question arises with regard to the representative nature of this sample. In selecting this sample, a random selection of cases appearing on the G Court[1] calendar as first appearances were taken over a period of 4 - 5 months, and subsequently screened through the police drunk records. Those who did not go to jail were more likely to refuse an interview than those who did go. Quite possibly a class bias was introduced between those who had the resources to pay the fine (or received suspended sentences) and those who did not. As we shall see below, the sample of first offenders who agreed to be interviewed was almost entirely self-selected[2], and, lacking data on the universe of first offenders, we can only speculate as to how much and in which direction(s) our present group is a reliable sample of the universe.

As a result of these contaminations (or possible contaminations) we shall make no attempt to generalize from the sample statistics to a universe of first offenders for the purpose of making statements or predictions about the "average first offender"; rather, we will confine ourselves to examining the vulnerabilities in our present sample to chronic drunkenness offender recruitment. As a result, our final conclusions will centre on stating the characteristics which predispose or lay open an individual to C.D.O. membership. We will propose a model for the examination of a more randomized sample of first offenders, in order that future research will be able to predict with greater accuracy the fate of a given first offender. But for the purposes of clarifying some features of recruitment into C.D.O. membership, the present sample will prove quite adequate.

---

[1]The Magistrate's Court responsible for hearing all male public intoxication cases in the City of Toronto.

[2]See Method, p.3

METHOD

Sampling Procedure

The original sample was drawn from randomly selected days during the period from January 15 to May 31, 1962 (excluding Sundays and holidays when the court did not convene). Days were used up consecutively until the present sample of 50 first offenders was selected.

TABLE XVII - 1

FINAL DISPOSITION OF ORIGINAL SAMPLE

(N = 265)

	Number	%
Refusals[a]	38	13.4
Non-first offenders	52	19.8
Wrong address and/or name	61	23.2
Moved - untraceable	27	10.3
Unable to contact	18	6.9
Out of town	16	6.1
No fixed address	3	1.1
Interviewed	50	19.1

[a]Includes refusals at initial contact and at subsequent contacts.

All individuals treated by the court as first offenders on these selected days[3] were contacted and each man was briefly introduced to the study and his cooperation elicited. The subjects were, however, encouraged not to make a decision at that point but were told that the research staff would be in touch with them in a day or so. This was done primarily to allow time to check the subjects through the police records for previous drunk offences. It was also felt that the court situation might not be most conducive to a cooperative mood. (In fact, four out of the thirty-five refusals occurred at initial contact). The only other question posed at this preliminary contact was to enquire whether the man's name and address was that which was listed by the police and the courts. As might be expected, not a single correction or change was volunteered.

---

[3]They were treated by G Court as first offenders if they had not had an arrest for public intoxication in the City of Toronto in the preceding 12 months.

The next step was a check on the subjects' names through the police department's records to establish whether they were in fact genuine first offenders. This check resulted in the rejection of 52 subjects who were found to have had previous convictions for public intoxication in Toronto.[4] (All original subjects were also checked for other summary offences and also for indictable offences but for other than sampling purposes).

In theory the remaining subjects (206 of the original 262) comprised the final sample of first offenders. In actual fact there were a number of other sources of sample reduction. (See Table 1 above).

A brief comment is called for with respect to the "mortality" categories since they reflect certain characteristics of the drunkenness offender population with particular relevance to first offenders.

With respect to the 31 refusals at subsequent contacts, it would appear that they fall into a number of response patterns. One sub-group "would like to forget about it as soon as possible" and the interview would remind them of an unhappy, unfortunate, etc. experience. These men were typically polite and appreciative of the purposes of the research, as were the group that can be best classified as the "refusal by evasion" subjects.

This second group typically gave the interviewer the "run-around" by evading a definite appointment, or, in the event that one was made, by not meeting it. At no point was there either outright refusal or open hostility. Sometimes an alternative method of evasion was employed where an intermediary, who was equally evasive, was involved.

The third major sub-group of "refusers" included all the outright rejections. These men usually expressed hostility towards the police, the courts, the law and to some extent towards the activities of the researchers. The typical position was that they had not been drunk and even if they had been, they should not have been arrested. Interestingly, it was the impression of the interviewers that a number of men in this category showed evidence of intoxication at the time of their refusal.

---

[4]No effort was made initially to establish drunkenness offences in communities other than Metropolitan Toronto.

That 52 (19.8%) of the "original subjects" who were considered first offenders by the courts had actually been arrested before is quite interesting. If the original sample was in fact representative of all court-defined first offenders, it would suggest that one out of every five have had previous convictions for public intoxication in Toronto alone. Even more striking is the finding that the 31 previously convicted subjects on whom complete and specific information was available, had accumulated 169 drunk offences over an aggregate period of 161 years. This averages out to a rate of just over one drunk conviction per year for an average period of 5.2 years. This would suggest that at least a substantial portion of court-defined "first offenders" have encountered continual difficulties with the law in the area of drinking.

The large number of first offenders (61) who provided the police with a wrong address and/or the wrong name is also of interest, but the possible significance of this to their drinking behaviour can only be speculated on. An examination of the disposition of these 61 cases reveals that 34 paid their fines, 25 were given time to pay their fines, two were given a suspended sentence and none went to jail. The fact that 34 were able to pay their fine and that the court saw fit to give 25 men time to pay their fine would suggest that these first offenders were financially solvent enough to pay the fine or appeared financially stable enough to be granted time to pay their fine. The fact that none went to jail also distinguishes them from at least part of the interviewed group and the specious first offenders discussed above. In fact, it might be reasonable to conclude that this group who gave the wrong information includes the largest number of genuine first offenders.

Two related groups totalling 45 subjects were made up of persons who could not be contacted although they were bona fide first offenders in terms of their police record and we were apparently in possession of their correct address. One of these groups (27 men) was made up of men who had changed residences between the time of arrest and the time when contact was attempted. Since the lapsed time was usually four to seven days, this would suggest that the group displayed a marked degree of residential mobility and possible social and/or financial instability. Almost all of these men appeared to be living in rooming houses in deteriorated areas and this would suggest something about their financial security and social integration.

The second group in this category is made up of 18 men who were first offenders, who gave the right address but could not be contacted even after repeated attempts. In most cases even indirect attempts at contact did not succeed so we can only assume that our timing was completely wrong or that they were temporarily away from home for some reason or other. In the other cases, other members of the family, landlords, etc. were contacted and the subject's willingness to cooperate established. However, repeated attempts at a mutually satisfactory time and place or even direct contact with the subject were not effective. It is possible that some of these cases represent deliberate evasion.

A total of 16 men were found to be from nearby places outside Metropolitan Toronto including Hamilton, Buffalo, Peterborough, Brantford, Richmond Hill, and so on. No attempt was made to interview them although they all turned out to be first offenders. Of these 16 men, 12 paid their fine while the other four were given a suspended sentence. One man in this latter group was granted his freedom by the Court on agreeing to leave Toronto.

The remaining three men in the original sample who were not interviewed were all men who told the police, the Court and the research staff person that they had no present address. Their dress and general appearance suggested that this was the case and even though they were all true first offenders, there was no convenient basis of contacting them.

Thus, of this original sample of 262 men, all but 50 were eliminated for reasons described above.

The Interview

Several days after initial contact, all eligible subjects were contacted again by one of the interviewers. At this time an interview was arranged with the selected subjects who had remained willing to be interviewed and were found to be true first offenders. The nature and aims of the project were explained to them and their help solicited.

The interviews took place, for the most part, within a week of the trial. As a result, most of those committed to prison for non-payment of their fine were interviewed in the Don Jail and provided a readily accessible "captive audience" that could be interviewed at the convenience of the interviewer and the daily prison schedule. Most of the remaining (29) subjects were interviewed at home, although some preferred to arrange interviews at their place of work or at the interviewer's office, usually in order to keep the matter out of earshot of their families. In these cases, appropriate interview times were arranged at the convenience of both the interviewer and interviewee.

The interviews took from about one and a half to three hours, this length of time being largely determined by the length of the questionnaire, but in some cases also affected by such problems as a language barrier (in the cases of a few of the foreign born and French Canadian respondents), by unforeseen or renewed reluctance on the part of the interviewee to answer all or some types of questions, or by the varying requirements of the individual respondents for reassurance, encouragement or simply additional information on the nature of the project they were to take part in. Once the interviews got under way, there was little difference noted between their reactions and those of the chronic drunkenness offenders who were asked similar but more detailed questions. Both groups seemed willing to answer all questions asked them without great hesitation or embarassment.

As in any interview situation, difficulties in eliciting information arose which need not be dwelt upon at this time. There were, however, some instances where special and important contaminations may have biased the response of our first offenders, and these bear comment. Ideally the interviews were to be conducted in complete privacy, but, in fact, 8 were conducted in the occasional or continuous presence of the respondent's wife, one in the presence of his parents and one in the occasional presence of fellow employees. This infringement of privacy in the interview situation might have biased the truthfulness of the respondents in such question areas as marital satisfaction, childhood background, extent of drinking problem, and so on. Further, one of the respondents was conspicuously intoxicated when interviewed; it is difficult, however, in this instance, to judge what types of contaminations might have been introduced by this factor.

Also, the fact that the interview was in some way connected with an official government agency and the result

of the respondent's arrest and conviction for what was often his first offence of any kind would tend to sensitize the respondent to questions about his attitude towards the police, the courts and jail authorities. We would expect as a result that many might soft-pedal their negative attitudes towards the legal system and its representatives. (These attitudes will be examined briefly below.)

In addition to completing the interview questionnaire, the interviewers were requested to compose an impressionistic evaluation of the respondent (after his interview) on the basis of his answers to the questions posed, how he answered them and the general tenor of the interview situation (as this may have been pertinent to the respondent's social condition, behaviour, and so on). We found on processing the data that very often one or two impressions or observations made by the interviewer tended to put the whole set of questionnaire responses in a new perspective for a more economical and integrated interpretation of the data. In general, the subtle probing and interpretation of the interviewers, two male social workers who had previously interviewed chronic drunkenness offenders, tended to expand greatly on the "meaning" of responses obtained.

The reasons given by our 50 respondents for participating in this project were of 50 different shadings, although certain predominant patterns were discerned. Some apparently felt obliged as public-spirited citizens to take part in a socially important experiment. Others felt legally obliged to do so, although the interviewer neither confirmed nor denied that it was obligatory. Some felt this was an opportunity to explain themselves and to clear their names of what they considered an unjustified and disrespectful smear on their reputations by the police and courts. This suggests that they interpreted our project as some sort of public poll by which the legal authorities might eventually get their come-uppance. Another sizeable group of first offenders, and especially (and almost universally) those who were socially dislocated or marginal individuals, seized upon this interview as an opportunity to tell someone their troubles, to relive bits of their past and simply to talk to someone who would listen patiently to them. If nothing else, a large part of the first offender group is very lonely and for these men the interview came as a respite from an otherwise dreary, monotonous and alienated existence.

There is some interesting evidence from another section of our study[5] which might let us infer something more about the motives for self-selection and information-giving in the sample of 50 first offenders interviewed below. We find, for instance, that of 1,765 men arrested once during the preceding year (a "1 in 5" sample of all such cases in G Court) only 47 of these men pleaded "not guilty" to the charge of public drunkenness brought against them. On examination, one finds that these men tend to have a significantly higher occupational status (on the average) than those pleading guilty; that they are more frequently married and more frequently have a fixed address. If one infers from this that social stability is likely to produce a positive "self-image", which will in turn encourage self-confidence, and perhaps even incorrigibility, such a line of inferences is borne out by evidence derived from the 50 first offenders we interviewed intensively. It will be shown in the body of this study that men who are married, who live with their families, are employed, have relatives living in Toronto, and have a relatively good job, are, according to their statements, less willing to change their drinking behaviour (as a result of this arrest) than are men who lack any of the above sources of security and self-confidence - that is, men who live alone, are jobless or in a poorly paying or uncertain job, without relatives in Toronto, without a place to live, and so on.

Our 50 first offenders selected themselves into our sample for an interview for various reasons, they also reacted to the interview in different ways, since they had not entirely anticipated what types of questions might be asked of them. In the case of foreign born and older respondents, willingness to participate in the interview itself appears to be motivated by a sense of obligation either to the community or to "the authorities". Reactions and responses to the interview questions seem to focus on the maintenance of a good reputation, a solid social position and positive self-image. A second group, composed of young and middle-aged men of Canadian birth, seems to have recruited itself for interview for the purpose of protesting its arrest and treatment by the police. These are likewise men who wish to "clear their names". It may be noted, however, that these men, while socially secure, have had at one time, or are beginning to have a drinking problem which they seem reluctant to admit to. Some of these men are experiencing other "problems" which we may surmise are making them doubt their own "goodness" or

---

[5]The Court Study. See Chapter V.

security, and it would appear that they are taking this opportunity to emphasize to another person (our interviewer) the virtue and stability which they themselves perceive as being put in doubt by this arrest: (the "methinks he doth protest too much" syndrome). Finally, there is the group of young and middle aged men who are in fact in rather grave social and psychological difficulties - whether due to their drinking, to their financial situation, to social isolation (i.e. the lack of family, friends or relatives); these men have come to the interview for the purposes of confession and expiation, and in the hopes of receiving some sort of encouragement or information which will in fact help them to change their lives and improve themselves. This group realizes that it is in transition from the socially acceptable working class world into Skid Row, and wants to halt this process of downward mobility.

It is evident then that agreeing and responding to an interview - an entirely voluntary act - had a personal meaning for the respondent: to some it meant apologizing and clearing one's name, to others it meant protesting and recreating a respectable "front" while to others still it meant baring one's soul and seeking help. Similarly, these three groups appear to represent stages in the Skid Row induction process. It would appear that honesty about the circumstances or problems leading to arrest for public drunkenness and thereby a willingness to change is a rare commodity for most; one tends to be honest with oneself (and with others) when the problem is so slight as to offer no real danger, or when it is so great that it is obvious to anyone. We shall examine these various types of problem conditions and patterns of arrest below.

THE ARREST

As stated in the Introduction, we are presently interested in outlining the conditions under which individuals are arrested for being drunk in public, and also in predicting which of our 50 first offenders are likely to become chronic drunkenness offenders. This section will deal with the first issue of interest - the conditions under which various types of drinking behaviour and different positions in the socio-economic status system (or class structure) of society make individuals differentially prone to arrest for public drunkenness.

Degree of Intoxication Prior to Arrest

While it is impossible to ascertain with complete accuracy the degree to which each of the 50 first offenders was intoxicated prior to his arrest, we have attempted below to reconstruct the pre-arrest drinking session and to measure, with several key indices, the likely degree of the respondent's intoxication.

From Table XVII-2, it is noted that almost half of the respondents had been drinking for 6 hours or more prior to their arrest. (This time span is not necessarily a measure of continuous intake, but rather measuring from the moment the respondent took his first drink until the time he left the terminal drinking place). One in 8 respondents had been drinking for more than 12 hours, either as part of a bender begun prior to the day of the arrest, or as part of a continual heavy drinking pattern.

TABLE XVII-2

NUMBER OF HOURS SPENT DRINKING PRIOR TO ARREST

(N = 50)

Number of Hours[a]	Number of Respondents	Per Cent
0 - 0.5	5)	
1 - 1.5	3)	24.0
2 - 2.5	4)	
3 - 5.5	16	32.0
6 - 8.5	10	20.0
9+	11	22.0
No information	1	2.0

[a]All answers rounded in half-hour units.

Converting the amount of beer, spirits and wine each respondent said he drank into ounces of pure alcohol, we find that almost half of the respondents had drunk 5.6 ounces or more of pure alcohol during the period of drinking preceding arrest. Reconverting this amount to a more commonly understood denominator, almost half the respondents had drunk the equivalent of 9.3 bottles of beer, or a little more than a "mickey" of rye (i.e. about 13 ounces), or the equivalent of one and a third bottles of table wine. Switching from one form of alcohol to another during the drinking episode was found in only a minority of cases, and the most common mixture was of beer in close conjunction with spirits.

It is possible to estimate the maximum and minimum number of first offenders actually intoxicated at the time of their arrest by the use of values estimating the rate of their alcohol metabolism minimally and maximally. Assuming an average body weight of 160 pounds, it is known (6,8) that no more than approximately 0.6 fluid ounces and not less than 0.4 fluid ounces of pure (i.e. absolute) alcohol can be metabolized per hour. Further assuming that we can take for granted such idiosyncratic conditions as affect the alcohol tolerance level of the individual as one's state of health, age, drinking history and so on, it has been established (3,7,9) that a blood level of 0.15 per cent (or 15 mg. of alcohol per 100 gm. of blood) is the average minimum concentration capable of causing loss of motor coordination or visible "intoxication".

Using these self-reported maximum and minimum estimate figures, it would appear that between 13 and 18 first offenders were intoxicated to the point of having lost motor control or coordination on the night of their arrest (see Table XVII-3). It is possible that an additional 5 F.O.s - those who were in the middle of a "bender" when arrested and had therefore been drinking for an unknown number of hours - might also have been intoxicated (according to those criteria) when arrested, while lack of adequate information prevents us from assessing the degree of intoxication of another three respondents.

TABLE XVII-3

i) BLOOD ALCOHOL LEVEL OF FIRST OFFENDERS AT TIME OF ARREST

(Metabolism Rate = 0.6 oz. per hr.)

(N = 50)

Blood Alcohol Level %	Proportion of Subjects %
.00 - .05	22.0
.06 - .10	26.0
.11 - .15	10.0
.16+	26.0
No information	16.0

ii) BLOOD ALCOHOL LEVEL OF FIRST OFFENDERS AT TIME OF ARREST

(Metabolism Rate = 0.4 oz. per hr.)

(N = 50)

Blood Alcohol Level %	Proportion of Subjects %
.00 - .05	18.0
.06 - .10	18.0
.11 - .15	12.0
.16+	36.0
No information	16.0

However, it is evident that a discrepancy arises between these figures, based on the respondent's recall of the amount of alcohol ingested on the night of the arrest, and the assumption that only those who are visibly intoxicated and have to some extent lost their motor coordination are arrested. Two alternatives present themselves: that some respondents had forgotten the true extent of their alcohol intake prior to arrest or were lying about it to the interviewer, or that the police had in fact arrested 25 or more of the 50 respondents who were not actually intoxicated at that time. We shall continue to consider both alternatives in the course of this paper.

Further, we examined the respondent's food intake during his pre-arrest drinking session (or, if it was a short drinking session, immediately prior to the session) to determine whether it was probable that a food "buffer" against the effects of pure alcohol intake had been achieved in the respondent's stomach. This was based on the known fact that food consumption may slow down the effects of even a relatively high alcohol intake (6, 9). The evidence in Table XVII-4 indicates that 40 per cent had eaten nothing at all during or immediately preceding their drinking episode and that another 16 per cent had eaten less than usual - a total of 56 per cent for whom the slowing down effect of food was lacking or diminished.

TABLE XVII-4

FOOD INTAKE DURING DRINKING PERIOD
(WITHIN 5 HOURS PRIOR TO ARREST)

(N = 50)

	Per Cent
Ate as usual	40.0
Ate less than usual	16.0
Ate nothing	40.0
No information	4.0

Physical Drinking Environment

Since all of our 50 respondents were arrested not for being merely drunk but for being drunk in a public place, it is of interest to examine the preceding drinking conditions which might lead to being caught in a public place while intoxicated.

It is evident from Table XVII-5 that three of every four respondents had been drinking in a public place prior to their arrest; that is to say, the terminal drinking place for that drinking session (since in many cases, the drinking was carried on at more than one location) tended to be a legal (licensed) public place such as a beverage room (68% of the sample), tavern, lounge, and in a few cases a lane, a pool hall or other such illegal public places. Only 6% of the sample had been drinking at home immediately prior to arrest, and only 14% had been drinking at the home of friends or acquaintances.

TABLE XVII-5

TERMINAL DRINKING PLACE PRIOR TO ARREST

(N = 50)

	Number	Per Cent
Private Place		
Home	3	
Home of friend, relative, acquaintance	7	
Other private place	1	
Total	11	22.0
Public Place		
Licensed		
Legion Hall	1	
Lounge, Tavern	13	
Hotel draught room, beverage room	20	
Unlicensed	3	
Total	37	74.0
No information	2	4.0

However, there was a marked tendency for the respondents to drink near their homes, as Table XVII-6 will testify. One-half the respondents drank in a place less than two and a half miles from their home, and more than one-third drank within half a mile of their home. It is probably the close proximity of their terminal drinking place to home which led them to travel on foot - thus increasing their vulnerability to arrest.

TABLE XVII-6

DISTANCE OF TERMINAL DRINKING PLACE FROM HOME

(N = 50)

Miles	Per Cent
0.0 - 0.5	36.0
0.6 - 1.5	8.0
1.6 - 2.5	6.0
2.6 - 4.5	12.0
4.6 - 6.5	8.0
6.6+	8.0
No information	22.0

These men did not avoid arrest while in transit. When arrested, nearly one-quarter of these men were still more than two and a half miles from home, but the majority of men had less than a mile and a half to go. (See Table XVII-7). One interesting fact arises at this point, as revealed in Table XVII-8: namely, that despite the short distance between the terminal drinking place and home for most of these men, nearly one-half of the men covered only one-tenth of this distance or less before being arrested. For many men, this meant merely taking a few steps on to the street in front of the beverage room before being picked up; further, only one respondent in ten got more than half way home before getting caught, again despite the relatively small average distances involved.

TABLE XVII-7

NUMBER OF MILES[a] FROM HOME WHEN ARRESTED

(N = 50)

Miles	Per Cent
0.0 - 0.5	36.0
0.6 - 1.5	12.0
1.6 - 2.5	6.0
2.6 - 4.5	10.0
4.6 - 6.5	10.0
6.6+	2.0
No information and N.A.	24.0

[a]In straight line path

TABLE XVII-8

PER CENT TRAVELLED OF DISTANCE BETWEEN TERMINAL DRINKING PLACE AND DESTINATION BEFORE BEING ARRESTED

(N = 50)

Per Cent of Distance	Per Cent
0 - 10	46.0
11 - 30	8.0
31 - 50	8.0
51 - 70	2.0
71 - 90	4.0
91 -100	4.0
No information	20.0
N.A.	8.0

The majority of respondents were headed for home, either directly or by way of slight detour to a source of public transportation (such as a cab stand, bus stop and so on), when arrested (see Table XVII-9). But at least one in ten had no home to go to, while others were merely passing the time or wandering along the streets without any particular immediate destination.

TABLE XVII-9

INTENDED DESTINATION PRIOR TO ARREST

(N = 50)

	Per Cent
Home	28.0
On way to source of transportation	12.0
Nowhere in particular; just walking, waiting	10.0
Another public drinking place	4.0
Lost	2.0
Other	18.0
No information	26.0

We examined the geographic locations of the respondent's home, terminal drinking place and place of arrest, locating each place in the appropriate census tract area for purposes of comparison with such characteristics in the larger G Court sample. We found that the same census tracts which were characteristically inhabited by chronic drunkenness offenders and provided them with places to drink tended to provide the first offenders with similar facilities. For simplicity, however, we reduced our listing of locations to several larger districts encompassing many census tracts according to their distance from the centre of Toronto's downtown district (which we arbitrarily chose to be the intersection of Yonge and Dundas Streets). By this method we were able to show (see Tables XVII-10, XVII-11, XVII-12) that the residence, drinking places and place of arrest of these first drunkenness (and chronic drunkenness) offenders tended to fall within one or two miles of downtown Toronto. The likelihood of this distribution of residences, drinking places and arrests

happening purely by chance is much less than one in a thousand, and we are thereby given some insight into the socio-economic status of our respondents, and the differential opportunity and efficiency of the Metropolitan Toronto police in arresting drunkenness offenders. It is evident that our sample was predominantly drawn from the lower economic stratum of society (going only by the evidence given us by their residence); they tended to live in the run-down residential and rooming house areas of central Toronto City. Since they lived in central Toronto and tended to drink at drinking places relatively close to home, their drinking was likewise conducted in the downtown areas of Toronto, and they tended to be arrested while on their way home, also in downtown Toronto.

TABLE XVII-10

DISTANCE OF RESPONDENT'S HOME FROM DOWNTOWN TORONTO

(N = 50)

Distance	Per Cent
Within 1 mile radius	32.0
Within 2 mile radius (but not within 1 mile)	20.0
Outside 2 mile radius (but within Toronto City)	28.0
Outside Toronto City	12.0
No home	8.0

TABLE XVII-11

DISTANCE OF TERMINAL DRINKING PLACE FROM DOWNTOWN TORONTO

(N = 50)

Distance	Per Cent
Within 1 mile radius	52.0
Within 2 mile radius (but not within 1 mile)	12.0
Outside 2 mile radius (but within Toronto City)	12.0
Outside Toronto City	2.0
No information	22.0

TABLE XVII-12

DISTANCE OF THE LOCATION OF THE ARREST FROM DOWNTOWN TORONTO

(N = 50)

Distance	Per Cent
Within 1 mile radius	58.0
Within 2 mile radius (but not within 1 mile)	12.0
Outside 2 mile radius (but within Toronto City)	16.0
Outside Toronto City	2.0
No information	12.0

Another indication of both the class position and the vulnerability of our respondents to arrest is the fact that (see Table XVII-13) 84 per cent of them were travelling from their terminal drinking place on foot when arrested and were therefore highly visible to the police. This would lead us to suspect that drinkers who own an automobile or can afford to hire a cab would be much less visible and thus less vulnerable to arrest than are those drinkers who, for lack of money and/or because of the relative proximity of their residence, are walking home or to a streetcar stop after heavy drinking.

TABLE XVII-13

RESPONDENT'S MEANS OF TRAVEL

(N = 50)

	Per Cent
On foot	84.0
By taxi	4.0
By public transportation	2.0
By private vehicle	4.0
No information	6.0

According to the 1961 Vehicle Registration Statistics, there were 46 automobiles and 7 trucks registered for every 100 persons of the age 20 or over in Metropolitan Toronto; that is to say, there was roughly an average of 1 passenger vehicle for every 2 adult persons in Toronto. In our sample of 50 first offenders, only 7 respondents owned a passenger vehicle. There is a probability of about one chance in a thousand that this group of 50 respondents was arrested without this arrest being in some way related to their lack of automobile ownership (taking automobile ownership and use as both a shield from police observation and as an index of socio-economic status).

Evidence of Intoxication Precipitating Arrest

We wished to examine the role that unusual behaviour or circumstances played in the arrest of these 50 respondents. It is apparent from the testimony in court of arresting officers that arrests for drunkenness are made on the basis of some observable peculiarities in behaviour on the part of the drinker which attract the attention of the arresting officer (or the complainant) to the intoxicated individual. Table XVII-14 indicated that in a bare majority of cases arrest was, according to the recollections of the respondent, contingent upon the appearance of such peculiarities; however, in almost 40 per cent of the arrests the respondents reported no behavioural or situational peculiarities (such as staggering, fainting, collapsing, public disturbance, or complaint turned in). This would in fact be supported by the earlier finding that fewer than half, according to the blood alcohol ratings, had lost

their motor coordination prior to arrest. We cross-tabulated the conditions of arrest (i.e. with or without observable signs of drunkenness or other peculiar behaviour) with the district within which the arrest was made (see Table XVII-15). We found that arrest which was contingent upon exhibition of peculiar behaviour was one-third as likely within a mile of the downtown area than two miles or more from it. Or we can say that a person is one and a half times more likely to be arrested for drunkenness without appearing to be drunk, in central Toronto than in areas outside a two mile radius. This conclusion is of course based on unverified evidence from the respondents regarding their degree of intoxication.

TABLE XVII-14

UNUSUAL BEHAVIOUR OR CIRCUMSTANCES PRIOR TO ARREST

(N = 50)

	Number	Per Cent
Respondent staggering	7	14.0
Respondent faints, collapses	3	6.0
Respondent causes disturbance in public place	4	8.0
Respondent is reported or turned in by someone	6	12.0
Other unusual behaviour or situation	6	12.0
None of the above	13	36.0
No information	6	12.0

TABLE XVII-15

UNUSUAL BEHAVIOUR OR CIRCUMSTANCES PRIOR TO ARREST, BY DISTANCE FROM DOWNTOWN TORONTO

(N = 43)[a]

	Number of Miles from Downtown Toronto		
	1 Mile (0 - 1.4)	2 Miles (1.5 - 2.4)	3 Miles (2.5+)
Visible signs of drunkenness (e.g. staggering, fainting, collapse, fight, public disturbance)	20.6	16.6	62.5
Other visible peculiarities in behaviour or situation	10.3	16.6	12.5
No visible peculiarities	37.9	33.3	25.0
No information	31.0	33.3	0.0
(Number)	(29)	(6)	(8)

[a]In 7 cases no distance information.

In attempting to verify the statements of our respondents as to their probable degree of intoxication at the time of their arrest and the degree to which arrest was contingent upon the appearance of behavioural peculiarities, we found (see Table XVII-16) that the respondents' statements as to their degree of motor coordination were not significantly related to the degree of motor coordination expected of them on the basis of their blood alcohol level at the time of arrest. Respondents whose blood alcohol level was high enough to have caused loss of motor coordination (according to our earlier estimate) claimed to have been as much in control of their faculties as did those who were, to all intents and purposes, sober, as regards the blood alcohol level ratings assigned them; on the other hand, respondents who should have been in complete control of their faculties (according to their blood alcohol rating) reported staggering, fainting, creating a disturbance and so on prior to their arrest.

TABLE XVII-16

UNUSUAL BEHAVIOUR OR CIRCUMSTANCES PRIOR TO ARREST BY BLOOD ALCOHOL LEVEL OF RESPONDENT

(N = 42)[a]

i) Metabolism Rate = 0.6 oz. per hr. (absolute alcohol)

	Blood Alcohol Level	
	0.0 - 0.14%	0.15% and over
Visible signs of drunkenness in respondent's behaviour (e.g. staggering, fainting, collapse, fight, public disturbance)	30.0	41.6
Other visible peculiarities in situation or behaviour	23.3	16.6
No visible peculiarities	36.6	33.3
No information	10.0	8.3
(Number)	(30)	(12)

ii) Metabolism Rate = 0.4 oz. per hr. (absolute alcohol)

	Blood Alcohol Level	
	0.0 - 0.14%	0.15% and over
Visible signs of drunkenness	33.3	33.3
Other visible peculiarities	20.8	22.2
No visible peculiarities	37.5	33.3
No information	8.3	11.1
(Number)	(24)	(18)

[a]In 8 cases information insufficient to calculate blood alcohol level.

This finding may indicate one of several complicating factors, or a combination: incomplete or falsified information regarding the extent of the respondent's drinking or motor coordination at the time of arrest; the operation of hidden or idiosyncratic variables (such as tolerance level) which modified the effects of alcohol on the respondent's motor coordination despite the blood alcohol content at the time of arrest; or proportionately greatest alcohol intake just prior to leaving the drinking place.

Our findings on this question are somewhat ambiguous. Table XVII-17 indicates that the arrest of problem drinkers was proportionately less often associated with unusual behaviour or circumstances than the arrest of normal drinkers. This was the expectation, for it would support the hypothesis that problem drinkers would have developed a higher tolerance level for alcohol which would make them less susceptible to a lack of motor coordination given a blood alcohol content of over .15%. However, controlling for degree of intoxication (Table XVII-18) we found that the arrest of intoxicated problem drinkers was more frequently associated with visible peculiarities than the arrest of intoxicated normal drinkers. But once more in support of the hypothesis, we found that normal drinkers who were not intoxicated were more prone to an arrest associated with peculiar circumstances than problem drinkers who were not intoxicated. This would suggest that customarily immoderate drinkers required a higher blood alcohol content before behaving peculiarly than did the customarily moderate drinkers. This is what one might expect, since it is known that alcohol tolerance increases with increased use and therefore it would take a seasoned or regular drinker more alcohol to "get drunk" and to lose his motor coordination than it would a moderate and irregular drinker.

TABLE XVII-17

UNUSUAL BEHAVIOUR OR CIRCUMSTANCES PRIOR TO ARREST BY RESPONDENT'S CUSTOMARY DRINKING TYPE (N = 50)

	Normal Drinker	Problem Drinker
Visible Signs of Drunkenness	43.4	37.0
Other Visible Peculiarities	17.3	7.4
No Visible Peculiarities	30.4	40.7
No information	8.6	14.8
(Number)	(23)	(27)

TABLE XVII-18

UNUSUAL BEHAVIOUR OR CIRCUMSTANCES PRIOR TO ARREST BY CUSTOMARY DRINKING TYPE AND EXTENT OF INTOXICATION[a] (N = 39)[b]

	Normal		Problem	
	Not Intoxicated	Intoxicated	Not Intoxicated	Intoxicated
Unusual behaviour or circumstances	68.7	40.0	58.3	77.7
No unusual behaviour or circumstances	25.0	40.0	25.0	22.2
No information	6.3	20.0	16.7	-
(Number)	(16)	(5)	(12)	(9)

[a] According to estimated blood alcohol level.

[b] In 7 cases information insufficient to calculate blood alcohol level; in 4 cases insufficient to ascertain circumstances of arrest.

As a result, we must accept the fact that individual idiosyncrasy will limit our exact knowledge of the pre-arrest scene, since it is evident that even by using standard objective measures of intoxication such as the (estimated) blood alcohol level of the respondent, we have no assurance that the given blood alcohol level produces in every case the identical degree of motor disability or failure to coordinate movements.

On the other hand, there is the possibility that the respondents have forgotten or lied about the exact extent of their drinking prior to their arrest. While the motives for lying might be diverse and difficult to ascertain, it is certainly feasible that a drinking episode that caused an individual to get arrested for loss of motor coordination in public might well have hampered the individual's memory and his recollection of the extent of his alcohol ingestion. If there was falsification of information, it was not consistent, since a sizeable number of respondents admitted to visible peculiarities in behaviour prior to arrest despite a reported ingestion of alcohol below the "loss of coordination level" while, at the other extreme, others admitted to having ingested enough to cause loss of coordination but denied having been visibly intoxicated at the time of arrest.

It is probable that some forgetting or undeliberate falsification of the information has taken place, but is unlikely that this has taken place to any great extent since our data tend strongly to suggest the existence of idiosyncratic drinking patterns according to past drinking experience and present tolerance level. If simple forgetting were taking place, we would have expected a less consistent relationship between reported behavioural self-control (at a given blood alcohol level) and customary drinking type than was obtained in Table XVII-18.

What then can be said about the conditions preceding and precipitating arrest as regards the degree of loss of motor coordination, the visibility of peculiar "drunken" behaviour and the occurrence of peculiar, attention-catching situations? Using the metabolism rate of 0.6 oz. per hour, we established that 13 respondents had achieved a blood alcohol level which should have

induced loss of motor coordination, and yet only 4 of these respondents reported such a loss of coordination in the form of visible "drunken" behaviour. On the other hand, 10 respondents who should not have been intoxicated, according to their blood alcohol level at the time of arrest, reported visibly peculiar "drunken" behaviour precipitating arrest. While it may be true that more than 14 of the men (our minimum estimate) had actually lost control of their motor coordination prior to arrest, this is so obviously related to idiosyncratic conditions and individual tolerance level that one cannot ascertain with any precision the true number who were actually intoxicated when arrested.

We suggested above that not all first offenders are equally likely prospects for membership in the chronic drunkenness offender group. In fact, we discover in the next section of this study that only about 3 in 10 of our sample might be "candidates". The other 7 in 10 would definitely not qualify (at least for the present time) because of their moderate and/or controlled drinking behaviour, social integration and/or financial stability and lack of integration into Skid Row Society.

In view of this, we are led to wonder how the 7 in 10 "ineligible" first offenders came to be arrested at all since they possess, in varying degrees, constellations of characteristics in polar contrast to those of the C.D.O.

First, it is interesting to note that the least "eligible" first offenders[6] - 12 men who drink only moderately and on occasion and are relatively secure socially and financially - were made vulnerable by a series of unusual circumstances or reactions to their drinking on the night of their arrest. Most of these men experienced such extreme reactions as blackouts, collapsing and tripping and the unusual situational or incidental experiences recounted in the following quotations. In general, arrest for many F.O.s was a culmination of strange circumstances, bad luck, and only secondarily, intoxication.

6 See the typology p. 102.

We had a little fight out on the street, near the Lansdowne Hotel. We fought with two fellows in a car who made cracks about my wife who was coming to meet us. The fellows drove away when a motorcycle cop came. I tried to tell the cop about the car that just took off, but the cop thought we were a couple of nuts. The cop called a cruiser which drove us to jail. I didn't think I was drunk enough to be arrested.

He went out after supper without a coat on to buy a pack of cigarettes on Pape and Danforth. The police had just picked up a drunk there and stopped him because he was coatless. Because he couldn't say anything, not understanding English, the police arrested him. (Interviewer's account.)

I came out of their house, I was walking toward the main road (didn't know the district I was in). The cruiser pulled up. He said, "Where are you going?" I said, "I'm going home." He said, "No, you're not. You're coming with me."

My friend ordered a taxi for me. He told me he paid. He's a wealthy man. The taxi took me 3 blocks - Victoria Park to Malvern. He stopped the car, and he said, "Do you know this will cost you $3.00? Have you any money?" He said, "I want $3.00 off you." I said, "Drive me home and I'll see that you are paid, my wife carries the money." He got nasty and said, "If you don't give me $3.00 I'll get you pinched." I thought he was driving me home. He drove me into Main Street Police Station.

I fell on the street, I don't know when or where, it must have been near that last tavern. I remember I was

in a prone position when these two young police came and lifted me up. I thought they were going to send me home in a cab ... I was shocked when they took me to jail.

I was crossing at Victoria and Queen. The light turned red when I was half way across. I tried to hurry. With my back, I can't hurry. I might have lurched a bit. I'd started up the street when a policeman appeared by my side.

I was walking up Yonge Street just north of Dundas. I saw a couple arguing in a doorway. I turned around and was watching and when I turned around I bumped into a policeman. He said, "I'm going to take you in for being drunk." I could see no point in arguing. We walked up Gerrard and he called from the box on the corner.

(How did you come to be arrested?) "I haven't a clue. When I came to, I was in the station. All my faculties were clear. I was at #4."

He had been sitting at a table next to the one occupied by the entertainer, an American who was apparently shooting a line to a couple of women about how he had fought in Korea and naming a particular area in which he (i.e. the respondent) happened to be about the time this American said he was there. He (the respondent) claimed there were no American units there at the time, and from his table, called the man a liar. This precipitated a verbal exchange, which resulted in (the respondent) being forcibly thrown out by the doorman, sustaining cuts about his right eye and forehead and getting a beautiful shiner around his right eye which he still had when I interviewed him.

> Apparently a crowd gathered outside, a motorcycle cop drove him to the emergency ward of St. Mike's hospital, and he was arrested and put into a cruiser after he was brought back from this treatment. (Interviewer's account).

> They drove about 2 miles from home before they found a barbecue place. They bought a chicken and placed it in the car. Then they went into the lobby of the Winchester Hotel to buy some 222's ... his wife had a cold or something and asked him to get her some 222's. When they approached the counter, the girl began to spray the air and called his friend a pig. She accused him of smelling up the place. This led to an argument, in which they both denied farting and suggested that it was the salesgirl herself. She called in the manager who told them they were 'cut off'. He (the respondent) protested saying they hadn't even drunk in the hotel, and finally said they had to sell him cigarettes ... (he) threatened to call the police if he wasn't served. He called the police who then arrested him and his friend. (Interviewer's account).

This pattern of unusual arrest-precipitating circumstances is found although to a slightly lesser degree, in another group of 12 "normals" - these slightly more vulnerable (i.e. somewhat more frequent drinkers) but still not "eligibles". Such unusual circumstances are rarely noted in the arrest experiences of the first offenders classified as "C.D.O. candidates".

This difference in the circumstances precipitating arrest is partly due to the relative inability of the moderate drinkers to keep their balance and self-control, and to keep things from happening to them when drunk and alone. By contrast, the "C.D.O. candidates" likely possess a greater ability to maintain some self-control and perhaps limit their extreme manifestations of drunkenness to staggering. However

at the same time we cannot rule out the possibility that some or even a majority of the 12 normals experiencing unusual drinking reactions or situational incidents were "selected" for arrest by chance alone, given that they were drinking in the most highly arrest-prone district of the city.

In other words, these moderate drinking men selected their drinking place but after that, chance played a role in their selection for arrest. Once we recognize that certain social characteristics, chiefly socio-economic status or social class, would predispose them to drinking in this particular place and district, it is of little further interest to study the full range of social and personality characteristics of these individuals, which played no necessary part whatever in their arrest. In these 12 instances we have what could realistically be termed an "exceptional occurrence": a usually moderate, stable and respectable person drinking too much, not being able to "hold it" and creating or finding himself in, an unusual situation precipitating arrest.

Social Drinking Environment

Finally, we considered what bearing the presence of other persons at the terminal drinking place and at the place of arrest might have on the respondent's becoming drunk and being arrested.

From Table XVII-19 it is evident that the majority of the men in our sample were not drinking with close friends or relatives on the night of their arrest; one-fifth of the men were drinking alone at the terminal drinking place, one-fifth were with casual acquaintances or strangers, while two-fifths were with friends or acquaintances who could not be considered close friends.

TABLE XVII-19

DRINKING COMPANY AT TERMINAL DRINKING PLACE

		Per Cent
Wife	2	4.0
Close friend(s), relative(s)	6	12.0
Friends or acquaintances (not "close")	21	42.0
Casual acquaintances, strangers	10	20.0
Alone	11	22.0
	50	

When arrested (see Table XVII-20) 70 per cent of our respondents were alone and another 14 per cent were with casual friends or acquaintances who were not, at that time, sober.

TABLE XVII-20

RESPONDENT'S COMPANY WHEN ARRESTED

		Per Cent
Close friend(s), relative(s)	3	6.0
Friends, acquaintances (not "close")	5	10.0
Casual acquaintances, strangers	2	4.0
Alone	35	70.0
No information	5	10.0
	50	

Had the men been with wives, relatives or close friends they might have been shielded from arrest to some extent, assuming such persons were sober. A sober and interested person could have provided transportation or support in getting it; he could have provided protection by minimizing the behavioural peculiarities of his intoxicated companion, by watching out for police and, most important, by assuring the police that he would help his intoxicated friend get safely home to bed without creating a disturbance. As it was, in none of the 50 cases of arrest was such a sober and interested person present at either the drinking place or at the place of arrest, although in a few cases an interested (though not sober) person was present.

Socio-economic Status and Public Drunkenness Arrests

Most of the arrests took place in run-down areas of downtown Toronto where lower class persons, criminals and prostitutes drink and live as well as most of the men in our group, and which is under high police surveillance. Therefore we considered whether there was an implicit "class bias" in the arresting of people on drunk charges in Toronto. By class bias we mean that a particular socio-economic class is significantly more prone to arrests of this sort than are other classes. To prove this contention we must consider whether a particular class is more likely first to commit the punishable offence and then to get arrested for it more often than the other classes. However, first we must establish the preponderance in our sample of a particular socio-economic class.

Using automobile ownership as one criterion of class or socio-economic position, we found a significant lack of automobile owners in the group of 50 first offenders. Taking education as an index of socio-economic status, we found little difference between our group of first offenders and the general population. Among our respondents, 44 per cent had some public school education and 48 per cent had high school or more, while in the general population, 48.6 per cent had public school education, while 51.4 per cent had high school or more. There is no clear cut or significant difference here. However at the upper extremes a difference, though not quite significant, becomes apparent: there is an under-representation of upper high school and university individuals in our group. This tends to support a hypothesis that there is some degree of differential class vulnerability to arrests for drunkenness.

Using occupational category as another index of socio-economic status, we compared the most frequently held occupational category of our respondents with the occupational categories listed in the Canadian Census for Toronto City, 1961. We found a significant underrepresentation of higher occupational categories (such as professional and managerial occupations) and an overrepresentation of lower occupational categories (such as casual, seasonal and other unskilled labour) in our sample. This would definitely suggest the existence of a class bias in the selective processes leading to arrest for public drunkenness.

It is known that class position tends to determine drinking styles, for instance, the type of alcoholic beverage drunk, the place where it is drunk, and in general, the appropriateness of sobriety and intoxication on various occasions (4,10,11,12,13,16). Lower class individuals are more likely to drink regularly in a licensed public drinking place than are middle or upper class persons and are therefore more open to arrest for public intoxication. Further, they are more likely to have been exposed to and involved in heavy or regular drinking in the one-sex peer group, both in such all-male institutional settings as the armed services and work camps (including mine, mill, and construction camps) and in the beverage rooms close to home. In contrast, the drinking of middle and upper class individuals is less often outside the family group, is rarely in an all-male setting and is seldom regarded as the sport or proof of masculinity, which it is by lower class males.

The drinking patterns typical of lower class males are obviously conducive to arrest for public drunkenness since they stress public drinking, group drinking (although not in a family group or other group setting that would control or assume responsibility for the intoxicated group members), and heavy drinking as signs of masculinity and good fellowship. These drinking patterns are found less often in the middle and upper classes, thus partly explaining why the majority of those arrested, and those in our sample are lower class individuals. The fact that the police are most watchful for drunks in the economically depressed downtown areas of Toronto follows from the (legitimate) expectation that a greater number of individuals will be publicly intoxicated in these areas than in the middle and upper class residential and suburban business districts where a different drinking pattern prevails.

Middle and upper class individuals may, of course, become intoxicated in public drinking places also. However they are protected to some extent from arrest by police expectations: because of the class-determined disparity in drinking patterns, police would be less on the lookout for offenders outside the better hotels and lounges patronized by middle and upper class people than they would in the vicinity of the lower class "pubs" which are frequently favourite C.D.O. drinking locations. Further, since such middle and upper class inebriates would not be likely to live in the downtown area and could afford private transportation home (as opposed to public transportation and prolonged visibility to the police) they could again decrease the probability of observation and arrest. By taking a taxicab, the inebriate could avoid detection and arrest without breaking any laws for a prolonged period of time; by driving his own automobile, the inebriate might avoid detection and would, in any event, be open to arrest for impaired driving rather than public drunkenness.

~~There is no doubt~~, then, that class bias is to ~~be found in this sample of first offenders and can be expected in any sample of first or chronic offenders~~, both by reason of class-determined predisposition to commission of the offence, and also by reason of class-determined vulnerability to arrest (by virtue of differential police observation and differential offender visibility).

It is obvious that a person cannot become a drunkenness offender without being arrested, charged and convicted of public intoxication; that is, the police and courts must "label" the individual as a criminal before we come to consider him as one. One often comes to assume that because an individual has been arrested and "labelled" as a certain type of person by the courts, he possesses certain distinguishing psychological characteristics. In fact, the social structure is so constructed that certain individuals have a higher likelihood of being labelled a criminal than do others, on the basis of characteristics that are independent of personal psychopathology.

These sociological or 'structural' variables in arrest involve the individual being in a public place and (1) visible, (2) arousing the curiosity of a policeman, (3) alone or with intoxicated or uninterested persons.

1) Social Visibility is determined by various other "structural" variables - that is, variables which lie outside the realm of idiosyncratic behaviour, such as customs, rules, roles, statuses, and so on. For example, the social visibility of an individual depends on:

a) The amount of police surveillance and arrest activity in a given area. It has been indicated that such surveillance and activity is greatest in the densely populated and economically depressed downtown business, entertainment and residential areas.

b) The type of transportation employed by the individual drinking outside the home. Persons travelling on foot are most visible. The likelihood of travelling on foot is determined not only by the financial ability to own a car or afford a cab, but also by the distance from the drinking place to the individual's residence. Where this distance is short, travelling will tend to be on foot, and thereby highly visible.

c) The drinking patterns to which an individual has become accustomed as a member of a given social class, occupational or ethnic group. It was indicated that lower class drinking characteristically takes place outside the home among groups of men in licensed public places; such a customary drinking pattern makes members of this class highly visible.

d) The social patterns which a social isolate or "marginal man" must adopt to find friends. If he is of working-class status and has few or no opportunities to meet similar persons in another manner, the marginal man may be forced to cultivate friendships in public places, often in places characterized by a highly transient clientele and (therefore) a high degree of police surveillance.

2) Curiosity Arousal - that is, the degree to which a visible individual will attract and retain the interest or attention of a policeman - depends on another structural variable: namely, on the policeman's expectations regarding the appearance, dress, location and behaviour of "typical" drunkenness offenders. If an individual's behaviour is unusual, it will attract the attention of a policeman who will then attempt to conclude whether this behaviour is evidence of intoxication. The policeman must then decide if such behaviour, whether evidence of intoxication or not, merits arrest for the protection of the individual himself and others. Two issues are therefore under consideration: the individual's actual drunkenness and the policeman's summary assessment of the individual's safety and his danger or nuisance value to others. It would appear that the latter consideration takes precedence over the former in many arrests, as for example, in the processing of vagrants as drunkenness offenders.

Our evidence would further suggest that in the downtown areas the police so expect to see drunkenness offenders in certain locations and with a certain type of appearance that much less provocation (i.e. unusual behaviour) is required to attract their attention than in the suburban areas. The individual tends to be suspect just by virtue of his location and dress, without any initial reference to his behaviour, and therefore, as we have seen, may be arrested without either being intoxicated or endangering himself or others. Such an arrest may begin a chain of events - a "revolving door" - by which the individual loses his social and financial security, and no doubt his self-confidence and pride.

3) Social Company, another largely structural variable, will play a part in the probabilities of arrest. The presence of a sober and interested person accompanying the intoxicated individual may be regarded by the policeman as sufficient guarantee that the inebriate will be controlled and protected. However the probability of this occurrence is dependent on many factors outside the individual's immediate control (i.e. structurally determined), for example:

a) From a strictly legal standpoint, the police officer's assessment of the sobriety and interest or responsibility of the person accompanying the intoxicated individual.

b) The individual's past history of social commitments (e.g. his marital status) or geographic mobility (e.g. the presence of friends or relatives in a new city or country of residence).

c) The drinking pattern to which the individual has become accustomed as a member of the lower class, or as the member of an occupational group (e.g. soldier, miner, bush worker) in which heavy drinking in a public place restricted to male "drinking buddies" is carried on with some regularity. In such a situation, all present are likely to drink large amounts and therefore to be unable to look after each other.

Each of the above mentioned factors will play a part in determining the type of social company an intoxicated individual may have, and consequently the likelihood that he will be arrested.

The role of personality characteristics - of some psychopathology or more specifically alcohol addiction - in arrest for public intoxication is a

rather more complex issue. It is evident that the more often a person drinks, the more likely he will be intoxicated and moreover, intoxicated in public. However, we must realize that structural variables operate to get the drinker imbibing in a public place: most notably, social class background and social marginality. In the upper-middle and upper classes alcohol addiction does not become a legal problem (in the sense of getting people arrested) until long after it has become a social and psychological problem, since in these social class environments there is much protection from observation and arrest. In the lower and lower-middle classes, alcohol addiction may play no part whatever in the arrest of an individual for public intoxication, and so we can expect to find (as was indeed the case) some apparently well-adjusted and temperate individuals among those arrested as first offenders.

CONSTRUCTION OF A PREDICTIVE MODEL

We have indicated briefly in the preceding section the conditions necessary for arrest for public intoxication in Toronto. Our present concern lies in predicting the number of these first offender respondents likely to end up as chronic drunkenness offenders.

In order to determine which of our first offenders are likely to enter the revolving door, we make use of the comparative method - comparing the social and drinking characteristics of our respondents

with those observed among confirmed C.D.O.s. More specifically, having isolated what appear to be 4 main constellations of variables which broadly define the C.D.O. population, we will look for the occurrence of these constellations in our sample of 50 first offenders. These constellations or sets of variables have been arbitrarily titled "problem drinking", "social isolation", "socio-economic vulnerability", and "Skid Row integration". Any individual first offender with a high score on all 4 of these constellations must be described as a potential C.D.O., for all C.D.O.s manifest these characteristics, with the possible exception of Skid Row integration, a more variable characteristic of the C.D.O. population. An individual who scores highly on only 3 or fewer of these constellations cannot truly be classified as a C.D.O. candidate.

First, a word of caution. Lacking a control group - that is, a sample of "normal people" - we cannot measure the degree to which a trait is associated exclusively with C.D.O. membership. Hence we are forced to use informal insights or intuition about the nature of chronic drunkenness offenders, and cannot prove statistically that a person with such and such a trait is 95 per cent certain of being (or becoming) a C.D.O. At some later date, it would be profitable to draw a random sample of perhaps 200 lower and lower middle class persons from downtown Toronto and ask them the same questions the C.D.O.s were asked. In this way we could draw firm conclusions about the characteristics making for transition from lower class normality into Skid Row drunkenness, for we would then have a model of lower class normality, which we now lack.

However, to the extent that lower class persons are usually married and not usually alcoholics, the probability that they would differ greatly from the C.D.O.

population on such broad variables as social isolation and problem drinking is quite high. Our intuitions about some of the unique characteristics of the C.D.O. membership are therefore likely to be revealing if we look at the overall life-pattern or combination of characteristics of the C.D.O. group in contrast with the lower class normal group.

The one justification for devoting our major attention to structural variables as the basis for prediction of C.D.O. recruitment is that they are very highly related to arrest patterns, while individual personality traits are related to arrest in a much less direct manner. There is obviously a very complex and subtle interaction of personality and social structure in "producing" a drunkenness offender. Since the present task of this paper is to produce a predictive model that works with some adequacy in the real world we must simplify the task at hand by eliminating issues which are too complex, and theoretical assumptions which are too subtle, impracticable or intuitively unpromising.

We shall now go on to examining briefly each of these constellations individually, making the appropriate comparisons between first offender and chronic drunkenness offender groups as we go. After completing this, we shall take a final look at our fifty respondents and make a definite prediction, on the basis of our objective data, as to how many are C.D.O. candidates.

Problem Drinking

Almost by definition, the feature most characteristic (and in fact universally so) of the C.D.O. group is "problem" or addictive drinking - drinking over which the individual has virtually lost control as regards the quantity and frequency of consumption. Such drinking is of predictive interest inasmuch as it is a concomitant or cause of social and financial disruption - conditions which are directly related to proneness to arrest for public intoxication. We will briefly examine the extent to which our first

offender sample is also characterized by "problem drinking" as the first step in predicting which F.O.s are potential candidates for the C.D.O. group.[7]

Table XVII-21 sets out a number of typical problem drinking symptoms arrayed in order of decreasing frequency in the C.D.O. group. None of these symptoms has had less than a "2 cases in 5" frequency of occurrence in the C.D.O. group. Examining the first offender sample as stratified by age, we find that only 3 of the 11 symptoms evident in the drinking histories of the C.D.O. group appear with a "2 cases in 5" (or 40 per cent) frequency or better - these three most common symptoms being intoxication, blackout, and heavy drinking. That is, few of the symptoms of alcoholism common in the C.D.O. histories were ever widely prevalent in the first offender sample. Certainly from this evidence at least there is little overall similarity between the C.D.O. group and most first offenders in the degree of problem drinking encountered to date.

Selecting 4 of the most indicative symptoms of problem drinking[8] - namely, morning drinking, shakes, blackouts and decrease in tolerance - and grouping them appropriately, we were able to examine the number of respondents in each group who had, at some time in their drinking history, experienced none, one, two, three or all four of these symptoms of addictive drinking. The findings, set out in Table XVII-22 indicate that compared to the chronic drunkenness offenders, few of the first offenders have been highly addicted to alcohol: only 18 per cent of the first offenders had a severe drinking problem at any point in their drinking history (this percentage expressing the proportion that had experienced three or four of the physiological symptoms named above)

---

[7] We shall be concerned here only with how much is drunk. The topic of "drinking styles" - that is, what is drunk, where and with whom - is an aspect of Skid Row integration and will therefore be examined in that subsection below.

[8] See Chapter XI.

TABLE XVII-21

HISTORY OF PROBLEM DRINKING SYMPTOMS (Per Cent)

Symptoms ever Experienced	C.D.O.s	First Offenders[a]		
		Age 50 and Under	Over 50	Total F.O.s
Heavy drinking	97.4	44.0	37.5	42.0
Intoxication	96.1	88.3	75.0	84.0
Non-beverage alcohol consumption	74.0	3.0	6.3	4.0
Blackout	69.9	44.0	43.75	44.0
Morning drink	66.3	32.4	31.25	32.0
Shakes	65.8	20.6	31.25	24.0
Loss of time at work or loss of job from drink	60.5	35.3	12.5	28.0
Decrease in tolerance	57.6	8.8	37.5	18.0
Daily drinking	45.9	29.4	25.0	28.0
Treatment for drinking	41.7	11.8	18.75	14.0
Delirium tremens	39.0	5.9	12.5	8.0
(Number)	(231)	(34)	(16)	(50)
Mean Per Cent of "No information" Responses in each sample[b]:				
	X_{ni} 2.7	1.6	7.0	
	σ_{ni} 2.68	0.6	6.25	

[a]The F.O. statistics will frequently be grouped by age into "50 and Under" and "Over 50" groups in order to reveal interesting clustering of factors around age-level. This will be discussed toward the end of this section.

[b]These statistics are to provide a quick approximation of the degree to which the above drinking statistics are limited in reliability by a lack of available data, that is, by "no information".

as compared with 53 per cent of the C.D.O. group. Almost one-third of the first offenders had never experienced any of the problem drinking symptoms, while none of the C.D.O. group had escaped these physiological symptoms entirely. This would suggest that at least one-third of the first offenders had never, according to their own statements, experienced even incipient difficulties with drinking.

TABLE XVII-22

HISTORY OF FOUR SYMPTOMS OF PROBLEM DRINKING
(Morning Drinking, Shakes, Blackouts, and Decrease in Tolerance)

Number of Symptoms ever Experienced	C.D.O.s	First Offenders		
		Age 50 and Under	Over 50	Total F.O.s
0	-	32.4	31.25	32.0
1	9.7	14.7	31.25	20.0
2	8.7	14.7	6.25	12.0
3	17.4	11.8	25.0	16.0
4	36.0	2.9	-	2.0
No information	28.2	23.5	6.25	18.0
(Number)	(231)	(34)	(16)	(50)

In Table XVII-23 we examined symptoms of present problem drinking, these being inability to control amount consumed at one sitting, spree drinking (i.e., continuous intake for more than one day) in past year, and amount of absolute alcohol consumed daily. In answer to the question, "Do you ever have only one or two drinks and then stop even if you have money in your pocket? What usually happens?", 6 first offenders reported that they could never stop until all their money had been spent while another 15 reported that they could sometimes stop and sometimes not. Eighteen first offenders had been on at least one spree in the past year. Just as proportionally twice as

many F.O.s age 50 and under as over 50 were unable to control the amount consumed at a sitting so proportionally almost twice as many had been on a spree in the past year. Finally, 10 F.O.s drank every day and of these, 5 claimed to drink more than 1.2 ounces of absolute alcohol (the equivalent of 3 ounces of rye) daily. (Three of these 5 drank the equivalent of 8.5 pints of beer or 13 ounces of rye daily.) These data would suggest that the majority of men were sporadic rather than daily drinkers, according to their own statements drinking mainly on weekends, holidays, or of an evening. Twenty-three men claimed that they could always control their drinking and had not gone on sprees in the past year; 12 men stated that they could sometimes or never control their drinking and had gone on sprees during the past year; the remaining 15 men were mixed in the type of control they claimed to exercise and in their spree drinking in the preceding year. Thus the evidence provided in Table XVII-23 would suggest that 12 men definitely had a drinking problem at the time of the study, while 15 were marginal.

What is the correlation between past problem drinking and present problem or uncontrolled drinking? We examined the proportion that had ever experienced selected symptoms of alcoholism and currently claimed controlled drinking and no spree drinking (Table XVII-24A). About one-third with a history of a given symptom made this claim. However it is evident from Table XVII-23 that the probability of being a controlled drinker at present was drastically reduced if the respondent had experienced one or more of the 4 physiological problem drinking symptoms discussed in Table XVII-22. A man who had never experienced any of these symptoms was 94 per cent likely to be a controlled drinker at present; someone who had experienced one symptom was 60 per cent likely to be so; while someone who had experienced 3 of the 4 symptoms had only a 12.5 per cent probability of being a controlled drinker at present. It is evident (Table XVII-24A) that a history of morning drinking is most closely correlated with present uncontrolled drinking, and decrease in tolerance, the least correlated. Thus of 25 first offenders who had ever experienced one or more of the 4 symptoms under discussion, only 8 were, at the time of the study, able both to control the amount consumed at a sitting and to abstain from drinking sprees.

TABLE XVII-23

PRESENT SYMPTOMS OF PROBLEM DRINKING

a) Ability to control amount consumed at a sitting (%)

	Age 50 and Under	Over 50	Total F.O.s
Usually (or always) can control amount	47.1	80.8	58.0
Sometimes can control amount	38.2	12.5	30.0
Never can control amount	14.7	6.7	12.0
(Number)	(34)	(16)	(50)

b) Spree drinking in past year (%)

No spree this year	58.8	75.0	64.0
On a spree this year	41.2	25.0	36.0
(Number)	(34)	(16)	(50)

c) Amount of absolute alcohol consumed daily (%)

Does not drink daily	73.5	87.5	78.0
0.1 - 1.2 ounces	8.8	12.5	10.0
1.3 - 2.4 ounces	5.8	-	4.0
2.5 - 5.0 ounces	-	-	-
5.1+ ounces	11.7	-	6.0
No information	2.9	-	2.0
(Number)	(34)	(16)	(50)

TABLE XVII-24

PROPORTION OF FIRST OFFENDERS AT PRESENT REPORTING CONTROLLED DRINKING AND NO SPREES WHO HAVE EXPERIENCED PROBLEM DRINKING SYMPTOMS
(N = 23)

A

Type of Problem Drinking[a]	Percent Now Controlled and Non-Spree Drinkers
None	93.5
Heavy drinking	19.0
Blackout	22.7
Morning drink	12.5
Shakes	16.7
Loss of time at work or loss of job from drink	7.3
Decrease in tolerance	33.3
Daily drinking	29.6
Hiding drinking from family or friends	35.6

[a]Refer back to Table XVII-21.

B

Number of Problem Drinking Symptoms ever experienced[b]	Percentage ever having experienced that number of symptoms now reporting controlled drinking and non-spree drinking
0	93.5
1	60.0
2	16.7
3	12.5
4	0.0

[b]Refer back to Table XVII-22.

What circumstances helped these 8 first offenders to control their drinking after a history of heavy drinking? First, most of these men became heavy drinkers when it was socially appropriate or permissible (given their environment) to do so - for example, in the armed forces or other institutional settings. Second, they were at the time young and in good health and did not report feeling any physically debilitating effects of drinking. These men arrested their progress toward alcoholism simply because they were no longer in a socially opportune setting for heavy drinking, or because they had become sick or older and could not handle alcohol as well as when they had been younger and well.

With one exception, the 8 men had always been controlled drinkers. The exception was a man who had become an alcoholic, down and out on Skid Row, drinking wine and "rub". He was then hospitalized and told by a doctor whom he came to respect very greatly that if his drinking did not cease, he would "burn himself out" and soon be dead. As a consequence, he has come largely to abjure drinking, although he says he will occasionally have a few beers. Another apparent motivation for this reform was the desire to be a good father to three young sons for whom he expressed great affection.

Table XVII-23 indicated that those showing symptoms of current problem drinking were more likely to be under the age of 50 than above it. Table XVII-25 demonstrates, in addition, that the younger the drinker, the more likely was his drinking to be increasing (usually both in frequency and amount per sitting). Thirteen first offenders under the age of 50 were increasing their drinking and they overlap the group of 12 problem drinkers to a great extent. There appears to be, therefore, a distinguishable group of young men among the first offenders who are embarking on a problem drinking "career".

Finally, we are able to examine the "fit" between self-perceived alcohol dependency and true dependency. In Table XVII-26, only 9 first offenders rated themselves "heavy drinkers" or "alcoholics". The drinkers under age 50 were 4 times more likely to rate themselves thus than a drinker over 50, although we saw in Table XVII-23 that the younger group had only twice as many uncontrolled drinkers in it. In Table XVII-26b we found a generally poor fit between self-evaluation and present problem drinking symptome. More than half

of those who had been on a spree in the past year did not consider themselves heavy drinkers or alcoholics; and about two-thirds of those who could sometimes or never control their drinking did not consider themselves heavy drinkers or alcoholics. The fit between self-evaluation and number of problem drinking symptoms ever experienced was equally poor - there was a tendency for the drinkers with a history of many problem drinking symptoms to rate themselves as being more moderate than we would expect from the findings in Table XVII-24.

TABLE XVII-25

CHANGE IN DRINKING HABITS OVER LAST FEW YEARS, BY AGE
(Per Cent)

Extent of Change	30 and Under	31-50	51 and Over
No change	25.0	69.4	62.5
Drinks more	50.0	30.6	12.5
Drinks less	25.0	0.0	25.0
(Number)	(8)	(26)	(16)

Frequently the spree drinking problem drinkers would refer to themselves as "occasionally get intoxicated" rather than as "heavy drinker" or "alcoholic". The former self-evaluation, as a euphemistic description of a spree-drinking pattern, is reasonably respectable and socially acceptable, since many persons without a drinking problem occasionally get intoxicated. Similarly the rating "regularly in moderation" provided a less threatening self-evaluation for many heavy drinkers, since "moderation" was not specifically defined in any way. Self-evaluation proved a relatively poor measure of true drinking behaviour for those with a drinking problem. Somewhat less frequently moderate drinkers evaluated themselves as problem drinkers.

Because of the small sample size it was impossible to get extensive data on the type of person who would rate himself as less or more of a problem drinker than he actually was. So many factors entered into this area of self-evaluation or "self-concept" that they could not all be cross-tabulated simultaneously with only 50 respondents. First, some respondents are likely to feel more threatened than others by the implications of their

drinking behaviour and would therefore be unwilling to admit their problem to themselves or to others. Some might not rate themselves adequately because they did not belong to a reference group which would provide norms for evaluating the extent of one's drinking behaviour; or, the reference group to which they belonged might provide norms for self-evaluation which were not in keeping with the norms of the larger society. For example, in our sample persons who customarily drank alone tended to grossly underestimate the extent of their drinking. Also, people born in countries other than Canada tended to underestimate the extent of their drinking, but not as greatly as the lone drinkers. (See Tables XVII-26 e and f). From the first hypothesis - that is, that people who ran a risk would rate themselves defensively and be unwilling to admit their drinking problem - we would deduce that a person well integrated into "normal" society would have most to lose from being thought of as an alcoholic or problem drinker - his respectability would be at stake. Therefore, married men would be more defensive than unmarried men, since the former would be more socially integrated, and hence would underestimate the extent of their problem. In fact this is what we found in Table XVII-26 d, although the differences are not significant. Given a larger sample, we would expect to find sizeable differences along this social integration dimension[9].

Social Isolation

By "social isolation" - the second constellation of characteristics of chronic drunkenness offenders - we mean the lack of attachment to or integration into such significant affective primary groups as marital family, parental family, extended kin or friendship groups. We are interested in the contact the first offender has with his wife, children, family and close friends, since we know that in the C.D.O. group such contact is infrequent. Social integration into significant primary groups is important since it is the main way, as many social scientists have pointed out, in

---

[9]This hypothesis is considered at greater length below on p. 80

TABLE XVII-26

SELF-EVALUATION OF DRINKING TYPE
(Per Cent)

a) By Age

Self-Evaluation	Age 50 and Under	Over 50	Total F.O.s
Occasionally in moderation	32.4	37.5	34.0
Regularly in moderation	23.5	37.5	28.0
Occasionally intoxicated	20.6	18.8	20.0
Heavy drinker, alcoholic	23.5	6.3	18.0
(Number)	(34)	(16)	(50)

b) By Present Problem Drinking Symptoms

Self-Evaluation	i. Able to Control Amount Consumed at a Sitting		
	Usually	Sometimes	Never
Occasionally in moderation	48.4	20.0	-
Regularly in moderation	24.2	40.0	-
Occasionally intoxicated	20.7	13.3	33.3
Heavy drinker, alcoholic	6.7	26.7	66.7
(Number)	(29)	(15)	(6)

Self-Evaluation	ii. Spree Drinking in Past Year	
	No	Yes
Occasionally in moderation	50.0	11.1
Regularly in moderation	28.2	16.7
Occasionally intoxicated	15.6	27.8
Heavy drinker, alcoholic	6.2	44.4
(Number)	(32)	(18)

TABLE XVII-26 (Cont'd)

b) By Present Problem Drinking (cont'd)

Self-Evaluation	iii. Amount Absolute Alcohol Consumed Daily: Not Daily Drinker	0.1 - 1.2 oz.	1.3 oz. or More
Occasionally in moderation	41.0	40.0	-
Regularly in moderation	23.1	60.0	-
Occasionally intoxicated	17.9	-	60.0
Heavy drinker, alcoholic	17.9	-	40.0
(Number)	(39)	(5)	(5)

c) By History of Problem Drinking Symptoms

Self-Evaluation	Number of Problem Drinking Symptoms Ever Experienced[a]: 0-1	2-3	4-5	6-7	7-9	10-11
Occasionally in moderation	81	0	25	0	20	0
Regularly in moderation	19	67	33	0	20	0
Occasionally intoxicated	0	33	33	25	20	0
Heavy drinker, alcoholic	0	0	9	75	40	0
(Number)	(16)	(9)	(12)	(8)	(5)	(0)

[a]Symptoms are: intoxication, blackout, morning drinking, daily drinking, heavy drinking, hiding drinking from family and friends, losing time at work or losing a job because of drinking, shakes, DT's, decrease in tolerance, and arrest for public drunkenness or for another drink associated offense.

TABLE XVII-26 (Cont'd)

d) By Degree of Addiction and Marital Status

Self-Evaluation	Problem Drinker		Non-Problem Drinker[a]	
	Married	Not Married	Married	Not Married
Occasionally in moderation	20.0	12.5	45.4	69.3
Regularly in moderation	40.0	18.7	45.4	17.7
Occasionally intoxicated	20.0	31.3	9.8	15.4
Heavy drinker, alcoholic	30.0	37.5	-	7.7
(Number)	(10)	(16)	(11)	(13)

[a]As judged by the respondent's stated ability to control the amount consumed at a sitting, and by his not having been on a spree in the past year.

e) By Degree of Addiction and Birthplace

Self-Evaluation	Problem Drinker		Non-Problem Drinker	
	Canada	Other	Canada	Other
Occasionally in moderation	16.7	25.0	54.0	63.6
Regularly in moderation	11.1	37.5	23.0	27.2
Occasionally intoxicated	27.7	25.0	15.4	9.2
Heavy drinker, alcoholic	44.4	12.5	7.6	-
(Number)	(18)	(8)	(13)	(11)

TABLE XVII-26 (Cont'd)

f) By Degree of Addiction and Customary Drinking Companions

Self-Evaluation	Problem Drinker			Non-Problem Drinker		
	Family, Close Friends	Drinking Buddies	Alone	Family, Close Friends	Drinking Buddies	Alone
Occasionally in moderation	-	8.3	25.0	37.5	50.0	100.0
Regularly in moderation	66.7	8.3	25.0	50.0	20.0	-
Occasionally intoxicated	-	25.0	50.0	12.5	20.0	-
Heavy drinker, alcoholic	33.3	58.4	-	-	10.0	-
(Number)	(6)	(12)	(8)	(8)	(10)	(6)

which the individual personality obtains gratification for such psychological needs as approval, acceptance, affection and identification. At the same time, integration in such groups helps to provide for physical care, financial aid, and regular food, shelter and sex. Finally, it affords some measure of protection from arrest and from imprisonment.

The chronic drunkenness offender group is unusual in the degree that social isolation has deprived it of the normal channels for satisfying the needs mentioned above. Both the facts of deprivation and the sub-cultural adaptation to meet this problem of deprivation are characteristics which separate the C.D.O. from the larger society.

It is immediately apparent from Tables XVII-27 and XVII-28 that while the chronic offender and the first offender samples are not identical with regard to their marital histories, they are very similar (especially the C.D.O. and F.O. "age 50 and under" group). This similarity is even more evident in the great contrast of both groups with the entire male population of Toronto City. Most noticeable is the preponderance of never-married males in both the C.D.O. and "age 50 and under" F.O. groups, which (for the C.D.O.s) amounts to almost twice the proportion of never-married males over the age of 21 in the Toronto City population. However most first offenders differ from the C.D.O.s with reference to present marital status, since 62 per cent of all first offenders who were ever married are still with their wives, compared to only 8.1 per cent of all ever-married C.D.O.s.

TABLE XVII-27

MARITAL STATUS OF FIRST OFFENDERS, C.D.O.s, AND TORONTO MALE POPULATION
(Per Cent)

Marital Status	F.O.	C.D.O.	Toronto City Males 21 Years and Over
Single (never married)	32.0	44.9	24.5
Divorced	6.0	8.9	0.9
Widowed	4.0	4.0	4.5
Married and together	42.0	4.4	70.1
Separated	16.0	37.8	
(Number)	(50)	(224)	(226,175)

TABLE XVII-28

MARITAL STATUS, WITH FIRST OFFENDERS GROUPED, BY AGE
(Per Cent)

	Age 50 and Under	Over 50	C.D.O.
Single (never married)	47.0	0.0	44.9
Divorced	5.9	6.9	8.9
Widowed	0.0	12.5	4.5
Married and together	38.3	50.0	4.4
Separated	8.8	30.6	37.8
(Number)	(34)	(16)	(225)

The two groups are dissimilar in the conditional factors which they say affected their present marital status. It would appear from Table XVII-29 that the single C.D.O.s remained unmarried mainly for reasons of "wanderlust" or compulsive independence. For the F.O.s, marriage was not shunned but was prevented by such conditional factors as health, finances and employment, and by the failure to meet the "right girl", to a greater extent than was the case among the C.D.O.s. Significantly, drinking was cited as an obstacle to marriage by three times as many C.D.O.s as F.O.s, giving further evidence of the more thoroughly pathological background of the C.D.O. group. Significant differences were noted in the causes given for marital breakup among the separated and divorced C.D.O. and F.O. respondents. Almost 6 times as many C.D.O. marriages had broken up over the respondents' drinking, while on the other hand, over two and a half times as many F.O. marriages had broken up because of drinking or infidelity on the part of the wife. Much more than the first offender group, the C.D.O.s had made their own marital troubles by virtue of their restlessness, independence, general instability and uncontrolled drinking.

TABLE XVII-29

REASONS FOR NEVER MARRYING
(Per Cent)

	F.O.	C.D.O.
Prefer being single; restless, independent, never considered marriage	8.7	46.3
Never met right girl	39.3	16.5
Finances: employment, health	39.3	23.1
Drinking too much	4.4	13.2
Other	13.0	7.4
No information	13.0	9.9
(Number)	(23)	(224)

TABLE XVII-30

CAUSES OF MARITAL BREAK-UP
(Per Cent)

	F.O.	C.D.O.
His drinking	6.6	34.1
Her drinking	6.6	-
Her infidelity	46.9	19.0
General incompatibility	26.6	24.8
Other	13.3	22.1
(Number)	(15)	(105)

TABLE XVII-31

FREQUENCY OF CONTACT WITH RELATIVES
(Per Cent)

	F.O.	C.D.O.
No relatives in Toronto	44.0	43.1
No contact in 3 months or more	26.0	22.7
Last contact, 1-3 months ago	2.0	5.3
Last contact within past month	16.0	13.8
Last contact within past week	2.0	3.6
No information	10.0	11.6
(Number)	(50)	(224)

As regards contact with their children, the first offenders show a much greater frequency and recency of contact than do the chronic drunkenness offenders, largely because of the higher proportion of F.O.s still living with their wives and children (see Table XVII-31). As regards other kin, both the first offenders and the C.D.O. respondents are similarly lacking in current contact with their extended family: in both groups, about two men in five had no family (other than perhaps marital family) in Toronto, while more than another one in five had family here but made infrequent contact with them (see Table XVII-32).

TABLE XVII-32

FREQUENCY OF CONTACT WITH CHILDREN
(Per Cent)

	F.O.	C.D.O.
No children	50.0	53.8
No contact in 3 months or more	8.0	30.7
Last contact, 1-3 months ago	-	1.3
Last contact within past month	6.0	3.6
Last contact within past week	26.0	2.2
No information	10.0	8.4
(Number)	(50)	(224)

TABLE XVII-33

PLACE OF BIRTH
(Per Cent)

	F.O.	C.D.O.
Toronto	18.0	18.7
Other Ontario	26.0	32.9
Quebec	2.0	5.3
Maritimes	12.0	19.3
Other provinces	4.0	2.6
Other country than Canada	38.0	18.0
(Number)	(50)	(228)

Only one man in five in both the F.O. and C.D.O. groups has definitely contacted his Toronto-based extended family within the last three months. As to why so few men have family in Toronto, it can be seen in Table XVII-33 that few men in either sample were born in Toronto: 18 per cent of the first offenders and 18.7 per cent of the C.D.O.s. It is not unusual then that so many of the remaining 82 per cent should have no extended family in Toronto, especially in view of the large number of men born in other countries (C.D.O.: 18 per cent, F.O.: 38 per cent) and other parts of Canada (C.D.O.: 60.1 per cent, F.O.: 44.0 per cent - see Tables XVII-33, XVII-34). Many of these men immigrated to Canada or to Toronto alone as adults.

TABLE XVII-34

COUNTRY OF BIRTH
(Per Cent)

	F.O.			C.D.O.
	Age 50 and Under	Over 50	Total F.O.s	
Canada	70.6	43.8	62.0	79.4
British Isles	11.8	37.5	20.0	12.3
Europe	17.6	18.8	18.0	5.7
(Number)	(34)	(16)	(50)	(228)

TABLE XVII-35

FRIENDSHIP RELATIONS
(Per Cent)

	F.O.			C.D.O.	
	Age 50 and Under	Over 50	Total	Non-Skid Row Friends	Friends with Homes to Visit
No close friends	41.2	50.0	44	44.1	56.0
1 or 2 close friends	23.5	25.0	24	15.8	12.9
Several close friends	20.6	12.5	18	21.0	23.7
Many close friends	14.7	12.5	14	17.9	4.9
(Number)	(34)	(16)	(50)	(224)	(224)

In examining friendship relations one good objective criterion of a "close" friendship is whether the friend invites you into his home to offer you his hospitality and introduces you to his family. However, there is a practical obstacle in using this definition of "close" friendship, since chronic drunkenness offenders may have Skid Row friends who are affectively "close" but have neither a home nor a family to offer. A second criterion for judging a "close" friendship in this particular situation is to examine how many of the C.D.O.s have retained non-Skid Row friends after their own entry into Skid Row. Intuitively it would seem that any friendship that would survive the dissimilarities of life-style and value orientation that separate Skid Row from larger society must be a strong and "close" friendship. Therefore we have examined both friendship classifications for the C.D.O. sample, since no more direct measure was available.

TABLE XVII-36

FREQUENCY OF CONTACT WITH CLOSE FRIENDS
(Per Cent)

	F.O.		C.D.O.		
			Non-Skid Row Friends		Friends with Homes to Visit
No close friends	44.0		44.1		56.0
No contact in 3 months or more	4.0	6.0	6.6	16.2	19.6
1 - 3 months ago	2.0		9.6		
Within past month	-	16.0	14.0	29.7	21.9
Within past week	10.0		14.0		
Every day	6.0		15.7		
No information	34.0		10.1		3.6
(Number)	(50)		(224)		(224)

Using these two crude indices for measuring the respondents' friendship relations, we find rather mixed information about the closeness of friendships in the chronic drunkenness offender and first offender groups, largely through a lack of data in the F.O. sample and a lack of adequate definition in the C.D.O. data. However, it appears from our data that between 45 and 55 per cent of the C.D.O.s and F.O.s have no close friends in Toronto, and that many in both groups tend to have infrequent contact with the close friends they do have, although it is difficult to say definitely which group is the more irregular in this respect.

It is evident from the above that more first offenders are isolated from friendship relations and therefore similar to the chronic offenders than have been similar on any other characteristic examined so far. (There have been more contrasts than similarities.)

Related to the examination of "social isolation" is the question of cultural and ecological displacement, that is, the removal of an individual from the neighbourhood, region, country or culture with which he is most familiar and within which he has the most social contacts.

We found that 4 chronic drunkenness offenders in 5 had been born in Canada; of these, almost two-thirds were born in Ontario; at least one-half of the C.D.O.s had been born and raised in urban centres; and finally, almost half of the C.D.O.s had lived in Toronto for 10 years or more, while only one-quarter had been in Toronto for less than 4 years.

TABLE XVII-37

TYPE OF AREA WHERE YOUTH[a] WAS SPENT
(Per Cent)

	F.O.	C.D.O.
Urban	50.0	52.2
Rural - Urban	14.0	4.8
Rural	36.0	22.8
(Number)	(50)	(228)

[a]before age 16.

In comparing our first offender sample with the chronic drunkenness offender sample on these various points of cultural and regional origin, we found the two groups almost identical (Tables XVII-33, XVII-34, XVII-37, XVII-38), especially when the F.O. group was stratified by age and the C.D.O. group was compared with the "age 50 and under" first offenders. A major point of dissimilarity between the two groups was the three times greater proportion of European-born Canadians in the F.O. sample as compared with the C.D.O. sample. However, in comparison with the distribution of birthplaces in the whole Toronto City population, both C.D.O. and F.O. groups show an underrepresentation of European born and an overrepresentation of Canadian born, the C.D.O. group to a significant degree and the F.O. group to a degree approaching significance. With regard to their province or region of birth (if born in Canada) to their urban-versus-rural origins, and to their length of residence in Toronto, the F.O. and C.D.O. groups were strongly alike, frequently to a significant degree.

TABLE XVII-38

LENGTH OF RESIDENCE IN TORONTO
(Per Cent)

	F.O.	C.D.O.
0 - 4 years	26.0	25.4
5 - 6 years	4.0	8.1
7 - 10 years	14.0	12.2
10+ years	54.0	45.0
No information	2.0	9.5
(Number)	(50)	(224)

In summarizing the findings regarding social and cultural isolation, we must conclude that the chronic offenders and the first offenders are similar in many respects: the majority in both groups appear to be significantly more socially dislocated (though culturally and ecologically integrated) than the overall Toronto City male population over the age of 21. Taken by itself, the similarity of the two groups with respect to this constellation of characteristics would suggest the possibility of many C.D.O. candidates eventually proceeding from this first offender group to full C.D.O. membership. This likelihood is heightened especially if there is, as some have speculated, a direct relationship between social isolation and problem or addictive drinking (1, 15, 17). Finally, this likelihood would be enhanced by the high probability of arrest for those without social company, as discussed in Section A.

Socio-Economic Vulnerability

A third constellation of features characterizing the C.D.O. group is its "socio-economic vulnerability" - its lack of occupational or overall financial stability, prestige or power. Socio-economic status is directly related to arrest for public drunkenness to the extent that it determines "visibility", "curiosity arousal" and "social company" (see Section on Arrest).

The indices used most often to indicate socio-economic class are educational attainment and occupational

status (or relative prestige). While other indices are used from time to time by various sociologists with a special interest in social stratification, it has become apparent that, at least in our society, educational and occupational status are the cornerstones of an individual's social prestige, power and life-chances. We find first that the chronic drunkenness offender group is significantly under-educated in comparison with the Toronto City male population over the age of 21. Similarly only 2 C.D.O.s in 5 had managed to achieve a white-collar occupational status at any time during their pre-Skid Row work career, and at the time of their first arrest for drunkenness, only 2 in 50 were white-collar workers, a significant underrepresentation of white-collar workers in comparison with the Toronto City male labour force over the age of 21. Finally the C.D.O.s at the time of their first arrest for drunkenness showed an unemployment rate of 10.7 per cent.

By contrast, the first offenders proved to be on the average significantly more highly educated than the chronic offenders, even slightly exceeding the Toronto City overall male population presently out of school in the proportion of individuals with better than an alementary education (i.e. 52%). The difference between C.D.O. and F.O. educational averages was especially marked, interestingly enough, in the contrast between the C.D.O.s and the "age 50 and under" first offenders - the two samples which have hitherto shown the greatest number of similarities with each other. We see from Table XVII-39 that two roughly same-aged groups (the C.D.O. and F.O. "50 and under") which would have had equal opportunity in the public schooling system (which has come to provide universal educational opportunities only within the last 50 or so years) have made very different use of the opportunity to gain an education beyond the primary school level. At the higher educational levels there were about 15 per cent more "age 50 and under" F.O.s than C.D.O.s represented.

It is evident from Table XVII-40 that while more first offenders apparently enjoyed a relatively higher occupational status at the peak of their work careers than the C.D.O.s in their pre-Skid Row work careers, the difference is not significant and the findings are somewhat inconsistent. However it would appear that the majority of both groups (i.e. two-thirds) have been predominantly blue-collar working class people, even at their career peaks, which would make both significantly

TABLE XVII-39

EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT
(Per Cent)

	C.D.O.	F.O.			Toronto City Males Presently Out of School
Educational Level		Age 50 and Under	Over 50	Total F.O.s	
No formal	2.7	0.0	18.75	6.0	1.4
Some Elementary	40.7	26.5	25.00	26.0	49.1
Completed Elementary	20.4	14.7	18.75	16.0	
Some High School	31.4	47.1	18.75	38.0	40.3
Completed High School	3.1	5.9	18.75	10.0	
Higher Education	1.8	5.9	0.0	4.0	9.3
(Number)	(226)	(34)	(16)	(50)	

different from the general labour force of Toronto City in a similar direction (i.e. tending towards the lower socio-economic strata). The average difference between first offenders and chronic offenders in present occupational status is clear from Table XVII-40. In contrast with the C.D.O.s, few F.O.s have casual or spot jobs while a relatively large proportion have white-collar, skilled or semi-skilled jobs. A main point of similarity is the relatively high rate of unemployment in each group - 32.0 per cent of the F.O.s and 86.7 per cent of the C.D.O.s. In view of the relation between socio-economic vulnerability and arrest discussed in the section on arrests, it is not surprising that one-third of our F.O.s were unemployed.

TABLE XVII-40

OCCUPATIONAL STATUS
(Per Cent)

a) Present Occupational Status[a]

Occupational Status	F.O.	C.D.O.
Professional	-	-
Semi-Professional	-	-
Proprietor, Manager, Officials	2.0	-
Clerical, Sales	10.0	-
Skilled	6.0	-
Semi-Skilled	32.0	-
Unskilled	10.0	-
Service (Protective and other service)	8.0	-
Unemployed, Casual, Spot jobs	32.0	86.7
No information	-	13.3
(Number)	(50)	(226)

[a]Type of work done in past month.

b) Highest Occupational Status Ever

Professional	-	0.0
Semi-Professional	2.0	0.4
Proprietor, Managerial, Officials	10.0	5.4
Clerical, Sales	18.0	13.4
Skilled	22.0	32.1
Semi-Skilled	36.0	20.5
Unskilled, Casual	10.0	15.2
Service (Protective and other service)	2.0	3.1
Unemployed	-	-
No information	(50)	(226)

Occupational mobility, or the pattern of moves from job to job and from status to status during the course of an occupational career, is used by sociologists as a good indicator of an individual's socio-economic vulnerability. An individual's original socio-economic status is that of his parents, since as a child he is without independent power or prestige, and has only the socio-economic protection of his parents. Therefore in measuring occupational (and socio-economic) mobility, it is customary to begin with initial status, that status ascribed at childhood to the individual, and trace the pattern of achieved status changes from childhood onward via the individual's educational and occupational achievements. We found (Table XVII-41) that twice as many first offenders as chronic offenders had experienced downward occupational mobility during the course of their working careers.

TABLE XVII-41

OCCUPATIONAL MOBILITY
(Per Cent)

Changes in Status During Occupational Career	F.O.	C.D.O.
No mobility	32.0	33.5
Upward mobility	16.0	29.9
Downward mobility	50.0	26.8
No information	2.0	9.8
(Number)	(50)	(224)

The crucial factor in this unexpected finding is not that the first offenders had on the average a lower present status than the chronic offenders had ever achieved but that the F.O.s had been born with a higher initial status than had the C.D.O.s and therefore had a greater possibility of downward mobility, in that more of them had ranks below to which they could descend. Subsequent examination of the father's occupational status for each sample (Table XVII-42) confirmed this assumption of significant initial differences in status, and as a result it would seem evident that occupational (or socio-economic) mobility will not serve by itself as a completely

valid indicator of relative socio-economic vulnerability in contrasting the two groups. It does suggest however, that C.D.O.s are recruited from among problem drinkers who, by virtue of their initially low socio-economic status and lack of significant improvement in status, are able to adapt relatively easily to the material discomfort and insecurity of Skid Row existence. This difference in class origins (and thus, the relative ability to adapt to conditions of deprivation) may serve as an important variable in differentiating the C.D.O.s and our present F.O. group.

TABLE XVII-42

FATHER'S OCCUPATIONAL STATUS
(Per Cent)

	F.O.	C.D.O.
Professional	2.0	0.4
Semi-Professional	2.0	-
Proprietor, Manager, Official	16.0	5.3
Clerical & Sales	8.0	6.6
Skilled (Manual) Labour	26.0	28.1
Semi-Skilled (Manual) Labour	10.0	18.9
Unskilled (Manual) Labour	10.0	12.7
Protective Service	-	3.1
Other Service	2.0	3.9
Farming	18.0	14.5
Other	-	2.2
No information	6.0	4.4
(Number)	(50)	(228)

Occupational instability, or the number of steady jobs held over a given period of time, was considered to be a more effective index in defining socio-economic vulnerability, since it was assumed that severe instability would indicate a lack of occupational skills and financial security.

TABLE XVII-43

OCCUPATIONAL STABILITY
(Per Cent)

Number of Employers During 10 Years Steady (Full-Time) Employment Period	F.O.	C.D.O.
One	10.0	7.2
Two - Three	30.0	31.4
Four - Five	16.0	29.1
Six or more	44.0	20.9
(Number)	(50)	(224)

We found (see Table XVII-43) that the C.D.O. and F.O. groups showed on the average similarly unstable work histories. In each group, at least one-half of the members had changed jobs on the average of once every 2 1/2 years (or more frequently), or, put in other terms, at least one-half of each group had held 4 or more "steady" jobs during a 10-year period of full-time employment. Certainly much of this lack of steadiness in "non-casual" labour could be attributed to the normal fluctuations in the market for skilled and semi-skilled labour (for instance, in such as the building trades, small manufacture and transport) - types of occupation of a large proportion of the F.O.s and C.D.O.s (prior to Skid Row induction). The end result was that both the F.O. and C.D.O. groups showed a picture of unusual socio-economic instability in comparison with the entire labour force and as a result strong similarities with each other.

Finally, we selected what appeared to be key individual items which promised to complete our overall picture of the average socio-economic vulnerability of these two groups (Table XVII-44). Compared in the possession of a bank account, life insurance, car or truck, and real estate with the chronic offenders, the first offenders showed a strikingly greater degree of affluence and security (see Table XVII-44a). For instance, 9 times as many F.O.s as C.D.O.s have a bank account, 14 times as many have a car or truck. However, in comparison with the entire male population of Toronto City, such relative achievements pale. As we indicated in the preceding

section, there was a severe underrepresentation of car registrations in the F.O. sample as compared with the entire Toronto City population; further, while no evidence is immediately available to support this contention, it would seem that the proportion of F.O.s without a bank account (over 1/2) and without life insurance (about 2/3) is a significant (i.e. low) departure from the entire Toronto population.

TABLE XVII-44

INDICES OF ECONOMIC STABILITY
(Per Cent)

		F.O.	C.D.O.
a)	Currently has bank account	48.0	5.0
	Currently has life insurance	34.0	9.7
	Currently has car or truck	14.0	1.0
	Currently has real estate	22.0	5.0
b)	Fine paid by self or family	32.0	[a]
	Fine paid by others	2.0	
	Fine not paid (Committed)	42.0	
	Time given to pay	16.0	
	Sentence suspended	6.0	
	Charge withdrawn	2.0	
	(Number)	(50)	
c)	Receipt of Financial Aid from:		
	Pensions, Welfare, Unemployment Insurance	28.0	27.2
	From family and friends	2.0	29.3
	From panhandling, bumming	0.0	36.6

[a]When interviewed all chronic offenders were in jail.

Of the 50 first offenders under study, 46 were charged and sentenced to a short (5 day) term in jail or a $10.00 fine. Of these 46 individuals only 16 or a

little over one-third were willing or able to pay the fine (with their own funds or those of their families); 45.6 per cent (or 21 individuals) did not pay and were committed to prison, 17.5 per cent (or 8 individuals) were granted time to pay the $10.00 fine, and 2.2 per cent (or one individual) had their fine paid by an agency of public assistance, the Salvation Army. It is apparent (Table XVII-44b) that financially deprived individuals form the majority of our F.O. sample, although the proportion of F.O.s able to pay their fine and avoid imprisonment is significantly greater than the proportion of C.D.O.s able to do so. At the same time, it must be remembered that the C.D.O.s would have a larger fine to pay than would the F.O.s.

Finally, we found (Table XVII-44c) that a similar proportion of the chronic offender and first offender groups were receiving financial aid in the form of pensions, welfare and unemployment insurance payments - a similarity which is not unusual in view of the extraordinarily high rate of unemployment among the F.O.s (i.e. 34.0%) and the sizeable number of disabled veterans. It is interesting, though, that proportionally 15 times as many C.D.O.s as F.O.s are receiving some financial assistance from family and friends - even if such assistance comes only from time to time. This is a significant characteristic differentiating the two groups for it emphasizes not only the greater need of the C.D.O. group but also the fact that the C.D.O.s tend to meet this need through a parasitic relationship with their families and non-Skid Row friends, and through an informal mutual benefit relationship with their Skid Row fellow C.D.O.s according to the norms of reciprocity that they hold in common. That a significantly smaller proportion of F.O.s are in need of such aid or are in any case able to get it would suggest the lesser socio-economic vulnerability of some and the greater social isolation of others (both in terms of integration into the larger society and into the "mutual assistance" C.D.O. subculture).

In summary, then, the first offenders tend to be less socio-economically vulnerable than the chronic drunkenness offender group, although significantly differentiated from the entire Toronto City population in some characteristics that point to greater deprivation and vulnerability. Perhaps the most important finding is that set out in Table XVII-44b dealing with ability to avoid imprisonment by the payment of one's fine, for as we know from the main C.D.O. study, a major characteristic defining the C.D.O. population is its inability to avoid not only arrest but also continual imprisonment for public drunkenness. That so many of the first offenders found themselves in such a financial predicament on their first arrest and over such a small fine may augur badly for their future socio-economic stability in the event of future arrests.

Integration into Skid Row Society

The final constellation of features which characterizes most of the chronic drunkenness offender population is one we have chosen to call "integration into Skid Row society". This implies that C.D.O.s are separated from the larger society not only by their alcoholic addiction and by their social isolation and socio-economic deprivation, but also by a unique set of shared values and norms which prescribe the ways in which a C.D.O. sees himself in relation to other C.D.O.s and to the "outside world". These norms define, within certain limits the types of behaviour and activities that are, as Robert Morton has said, "prescribed, proscribed, preferred and permitted" on Skid Row.

If these values, norms, attitudes and activities are truly shared and not simply similar independent solutions to the common problems of addiction, isolation and deprivation, there must be interaction between the individuals having similar needs. In fact, we could say that the degree of integration of an individual into Skid Row society, or the degree to which he is "acculturated" to the Skid Row value system, depends wholly on his degree of interaction with other Skid Row citizens. Without this interaction, the "candidate" will not, despite his similar needs, be socialized to meeting these needs in the characteristic C.D.O. fashion.

If there are to be relatively intense interactions between the participating members of the Skid Row society, there must be geographic proximity of the members. Put another way, we must be able to state the geographic boundaries of a given society before we can prove that it exists in other respects as well, and we must also be able to show that the bulk of its population interacts within the boundaries established for this society. To facilitate the interaction between individuals with similar needs, an area typically develops in any large city which comes to be known as the "Skid Row" area - a district with a relatively heavy population of transients, C.D.O.s and other socially marginal and/or deprived individuals.

Within such an area, greater allowance is made for the presence of individuals with the three constellations of characteristics demonstrated by the chronic offenders than would be allowed in a residential, and especially a "better class" residential, area. Facilities

catering to the needs and finances of these C.D.O.s - free or inexpensive lodgings, eating places, drinking places (licensed and unlicensed, public and private), inexpensive and informal places for meeting and recreation, and so on - are available. These are however, "high visibility" areas under the constant surveillance of police, representatives of religious and charitable organizations, and other members of the "outside world". We are not surprised to note (Table XVII-45) that nearly 80 per cent of the C.D.O population had a Skid Row address, and another 13 per cent lived in the districts immediately adjacent to Skid Row areas.

TABLE XVII-45

RESIDENCE
(Per Cent)

a) Residential Address

	C.D.O.	F.O.		
		Age 50 and Under	Over 50	Total F.O.s
Skid Row	78.9	32.4	25.0	30.0
Adjacent to Skid Row	13.3	17.7	-	12.0
Clearly non-Skid Row	7.8	50.9	75.0	58.0
(Number)	(218)	(34)	(16)	(50)

b) Type of Residence

	C.D.O.[a]	F.O.		
		Age 50 and Under	Over 50	Total F.O.s
No fixed abode	46.2	23.6	6.3	18.0
Room	47.7	38.2	43.7	40.0
With marital family	3.9	38.2	50.0	42.0
(Number)	(231)	(34)	(16)	(50)

[a]At time of last arrest - not necessarily the customary arrangement.

The chronic drunkenness offender, as a social isolate and without much money or a job is frequently deprived of the price of a room. An outstanding characteristic of the C.D.O. is that he is a "homeless man", and in our sample only 4 per cent of the C.D.O.s lived with their marital family. About 46 per cent had no fixed abode, living in small rooms from day to day, in missions, or in jail and out of doors most of the time, while 48 per cent claimed to have a slightly more stable rooming arrangement, either by themselves or with a number of friends. Since the C.D.O. tends to live in a public type of accommodation (such as a room in a rooming house or hotel, or in an outdoors place) rather than in a private one person or one family dwelling, the likelihood of meeting other C.D.O.s making similar use of such accommodations, and thus the probability of interaction, is enhanced. (Of all the C.D.O.'s customary accommodations, jail is probably the most important opportunity for prolonged interaction.)

Almost nine-tenths of the chronic offenders worked less than a week out of the month when outside of jail, leaving plenty of time for drinking and other recreation. However, the C.D.O.'s leisure activity was rarely very diversified, each man sticking to two, three or four types of activity in the daily routine (Table XVII-46). Characteristically, his activity was inexpensive, sociable but without a fixed group or organization membership, and was passive, restrained or "mental" as opposed to physically active or participating. Perhaps the most noteworthy characteristic about C.D.O. spare-time activity is that, like C.D.O. drinking behaviour, it tended to be strongly group-oriented, with an emphasis on persistent interaction throughout the day's activities. These characteristics were combined in the predominant (other than drinking) leisure activities among C.D.O.s "sitting and talking, reading, and TV watching", usually within a public or group-centred environment.

When we compare the first offenders, using the same criteria, we find much less Skid Row integration, seven times as many first offenders lived in clearly non-Skid Row districts and as a result had less opportunity to interact with C.D.O.s. However, almost a third of the first offenders aged "50 and under" lived in the Skid Row district. While 2 F.O.s in 5 lived with their marital families and were not immediately vulnerable to Skid Row integration, the 18 per cent who were literally "homeless" were obviously highly

TABLE XVII-46

SPARE-TIME ACTIVITIES
(Per Cent)

Type of Activity	C.D.O.	F.O.		
		Age 50 and Under	Over 50	Total F.O.s
Sitting and talking	75.8	11.8	12.5	12.0
Reading	66.7	23.6	50.0	32.0
TV	65.4	20.6	31.3	24.0
Church or mission	37.7	14.7	-	10.0
Cards, checkers, etc.	29.9	5.9	18.8	10.0
Movies	25.6	26.5	12.5	22.0
Other activities not otherwise specified	15.6	41.2	43.8	42.0
Sports (audience)	13.4	11.8	18.8	14.0
Pool Room	10.8	5.9	-	4.0
Sports (participant)	2.2	23.6	18.8	22.0
No information	2.2	26.5	6.3	20.0
Drinking	-	32.4	31.3	32.0
(Number)	(231)	(34)	(16)	(50)

vulnerable on this score. The fact that the remaining 2 F.O.s in 5 rented rooms suggests that a significant number lived in conditions that provided opportunity for interaction with C.D.O.s.

It was noted earlier that for some of the first offenders, unemployment was less a chronic condition than an interregnum while waiting for the "right job" to come along, while for most of the C.D.O.s the alternation of unemployment and casual work was a chronic condition. As a result of less spare time (and less opportunity for interaction in leisure activities) most

first offenders did not demonstrate as frequent or predictable leisure activity as did the C.D.O.s. This is emphasized by the finding that 42 per cent of the F.O.s took part in a spare time activity which was not specifically characteristic of the C.D.O. (for example, playing a musical instrument, doing repairs around the house, taking extension courses, coaching a junior team) while only 1/6 were likely to make "sitting and talking" (that favourite C.D.O. pastime) a part of their leisure activity (Table XVII-46), proportionately more F.O.s spent money diffusely, joined formally organized groups, participated or engaged in "active" activities, and especially significant, spent their leisure time by themselves as "lone-wolves" than the C.D.O.s (Table XVII-47). Further, although these first offender statistics are strongly age-group differentiated there is no coherent basis for systematically comparing the C.D.O.s with either the younger group or the older group. This would tend to support the contention that acculturation is the last stage to be completed in the integration of an individual into the C.D.O. Skid Row society, and that neither of our F.O. age-defined groups was close to complete integration. At the very least, it is apparent that leisure activity was not an important source of interaction by which many F.O.s were becoming integrated into Skid Row society.

Since drinking is a basic activity, and even a raison d'etre, for the C.D.O., it is to be expected that some more or less unique drinking patterns would evolve within the C.D.O. group in order to satisfy the aforementioned desire for constant group association and frequent intoxication within the situational context of an all-male setting and socio-economic deprivation. Poverty and the desire to maximize the amount of pure alcohol per dollar expenditure dictate what is to be drunk. Table XVII-48 indicates a significantly more frequent intake of wine and non-beverage alcohol, and a significantly less frequent intake of liquor (one-fifth as much) in the C.D.O. group.

Socio-economic deprivation dictates where the drinking is to be done, and poverty has always tended to reduce the amount of an individual's privacy and increase his visibility. The chronic offender in lieu of a home, a room, a friend's room or a private club, is forced to drink in public places - often in places which are

TABLE XVII-47

CHARACTERISTICS OF LEISURE ACTIVITIES
(Per Cent)

		C.D.O.	F.O.		
			Age 50 and Under	Over 50	Total F.O.s
A 1.	Cost in form of admission	32.8	20.6	0.0	14.0
2.	Cost in other form	5.7	17.7	18.8	18.0
3.	No cost	61.6	35.3	75.0	48.0
B 1.	Membership required	6.6	17.7	6.3	14.0
2.	Membership not required	93.5	55.9	87.5	66.0
C 1.	Associates required	96.1	35.3	12.5	28.0
2.	Associates not required (i.e. "lone wolf")	3.9	29.4	81.3	46.0
D 1.	Activity mainly physical	5.7	20.6	12.5	18.0
2.	Activity mainly passive or mental	94.3	53.0	81.3	62.0
	(Number)	(231)	(34)	(16)	(50)

unlicensed and illegal for purposes of drinking, such as lanes, backyards and verandahs. This is also significantly different from the drinking behaviour of most first offenders who, with two exceptions, never drank in an unlicensed public place and who tended to drink in private or licensed public places (notably beverage rooms) to a significantly greater extent than the C.D.O.s. It should at the same time be noted that the F.O.s were a socio-economically deprived group since in their public drinking they were about two and a half times more likely to drink customarily in a beverage room than in a cocktail lounge or tavern (Table XVII-49).

TABLE XVII-48

CUSTOMARY BEVERAGES CONSUMED
(Per Cent)

	C.D.O.	F.O.		
Beverage		Age 50 and Under	Over 50	Total F.O.s
Wine	90.5	38.3	25.0	34.0
Beer	82.8	97.0	100.0	98.0
Rub (and other non-beverage)	61.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Liquor	11.7	58.0	43.7	50.0
(Number)	(231)	(34)	(16)	(50)

Another reason why C.D.O.s are more prone to drinking in public places than in private places, quite aside from their socio-economically determined lack of privacy, is seen in Table XVII-50 - they are sociable drinkers, rarely drinking alone. In lieu of relatives or close friends with whom other persons might tend to drink with some regularity, C.D.O.s tend to organize a drinking group or "bottle gang" on the spur of the moment. Such impromptu interactive drinking depends, for its time, place and group membership, on immediately available cash and drinking facilities - which are expected to be shared. The major (albeit ideal) value

TABLE XVII-49

CUSTOMARY DRINKING PLACE
(per cent)

Drinking Place	C.D.O.	F.O. Age 50 and Under	F.O. Over 50	Total F.O.s
Public Places:				
Beverage Room	26.8	29.4	50.0	36.0
Cocktail Lounge	0.4	17.7	6.7	14.0
Unlicensed, illegal public places	53.7	5.9	-	4.0
(Total)	(80.9)	(53.0)	(56.7)	(54.0)
Private Places:				
Room (own or otherwise)	19.1	35.3	31.3	34.0
Other	-	2.9	-	2.0
(Total)	(19.1)	(38.2)	(31.3)	(36.0)
No information	-	8.7	12.5	10.0
(Number)	(231)	(34)	(16)	(50)

premise of the C.D.O. sub-culture is reciprocity - repayment in kind, equality of treatment, sharing of bounty, and the right to psychological and emotional privacy, but not to material hoarding. Seen by contrast, few first offenders are subject to this ethic of reciprocity, and many enjoy lone-wolf drinking or drinking with a specific group of friends or relatives. The ethic of reciprocity, as a type of mutual benefit arrangement, does not have the material value for the F.O. that it does for the C.D.O. Most F.O.s are not yet socialized to obeying this ethic and evidently not integrated into the C.D.O. society in this important respect.

TABLE XVII-50

CUSTOMARY DRINKING COMPANIONS
(Per Cent)

		C.D.O.	F.O.		
			Age 50 and Under	Over 50	Total F.O.s
Alone		13.0	26.6	31.2	28.0
Specific friends, relatives		0.8	36.7	34.4	34.0
Unspecified friends acquaintances strangers	non-SR	5.2	36.7	34.4	36.0
	SR	78.8 } 84.0			
Other		2.2	-	-	-
(Number)		(231)	(34)	(16)	(50)

A third subcultural characteristic is the C.D.O.'s interpretation of his own deviance - his attitudes towards the agencies of arrest, trial and punishment, and his plans to continue or discontinue his deviant behaviour vis-a-vis his criminality, his drinking and his consistent unemployment in an achievement-oriented society. It can be seen in Table XVII-51 that the C.D.O.s are not disturbed enough by their arrests for public drunkenness to plan or to change their behaviour in a way that would prevent or minimize the chances of recurrent arrest. About one in 20 planned to stop or control his drinking for any length of time on release from prison, and about one in 75 actually did do so (even if only for a few hours). Fewer than one in 10 C.D.O.s either planned to leave the Skid Row area or actually did do so on release from jail. Finally, about 45 per cent of the C.D.O.s planned to find work and return to work, although remaining on Skid Row otherwise, and of these individuals, only about 42 per cent actually carried out or realized their plan to find work for any length of time.

TABLE XVII-51

INCORRIGIBILITY OF C.D.O.s AFTER LAST RELEASE FROM JAIL
(Per Cent)

Resolution	Plan	Actual[a]
Quit drinking or control drinking	5.7	1.3
Leave Skid Row	7.0	2.6
Find work, return to work	43.7	18.3
Return to home, family, work, etc.	1.3	6.6

[a]Actual realization of this plan for any length of time, even if, as was most frequently the case, only for a matter of hours or days.

We should not lose sight of the fact that problem drinking is one main mechanism by which the "revolving door" of imprisonment and release is kept spinning for the C.D.O.s. While no doubt all of them recognized this fact, at least half were drunk again within 48 hours of their release from jail, and few were able to restrain themselves for as long as a week. The majority returned to their drinking in a typically immoderate fashion within a short time after release from prison.

The first offenders, on the other hand, indicated that they were much more affected by their arrest, and were approximately 5 times as willing to reform their drinking behaviour in order to avoid arrest as the C.D.O.s (Table XVII-52). A very interesting finding emerges at this point: it can be seen from the evidence in Tables XVIII-53a,b,c,d,e, and f that the more socially isolated and socio-economically unstable the individual first offender, the more likely he was to express a willingness to reform his drinking behaviour. This suggests that social integration and socio-psychological support in the face of such extreme degradations as arrest and punishment will tend to secure the individual against either great remorse or willingness to reform. Further, that both the C.D.O.s and the integrated, less vulnerable F.O.s were equally incorrigible would suggest that social integration

into the larger society or into the Skid Row society provided equally strong inertia against reform or change. On this basis it should be discovered later that some of the 37 incorrigible F.O.s are C.D.O. candidates and others are definitely not C.D.O. candidates, each F.O. having as his own stable reference group either the C.D.O. society or the larger social milieu.

TABLE XVII-52

CHANGES IN BEHAVIOUR PLANNED AS RESULT OF ARREST
(Per Cent)

	C.D.O.	F.O.		
		Age 50 and Under	Over 50	Total F.O.s
Incorrigible:				
No changes		14.6	18.8	
More cautious when breaking law		32.4	25.0	
Other		17.6	6.2	
(Total)	(75.1)	(64.6)	(50.0)	(58.0)
Undecided:	19.2	8.8	18.8	12.0
Willing to Change:				
Drink less in future or cut it out entirely	5.7	20.6	12.5	
Won't drink outside home			12.5	
Other		2.9	6.3	
(Total)	(5.7)	(23.5)	(31.5)	(26.0)
(Number)	(231)	(34)	(16)	(50)

TABLE XVII-53

INCORRIGIBILITY OF FIRST OFFENDERS BY SELECTED VARIABLES
(Per Cent)

a) by Marital Status

	Married	Single	Separated, Divorced	Widowed
Won't change	95.3	50.0	9.0	50.0
Undecided	0.0	12.5	18.3	50.0
Will change	4.7	37.5	72.7	0.0
(Number)	(21)	(16)	(11)	(2)

b) by Residence

	With Marital Family	Room alone	No fixed abode
Won't change	95.3	35.0	11.1
Undecided	0.0	25.0	22.2
Will change	4.7	40.0	66.7
(Number)	(21)	(20)	(9)

c) by Employment Status

	Employed	Unemployed	Retired, Unemployable
Won't change	70.5	38.9	83.3
Undecided	11.7	11.1	0.0
Will change	17.6	50.0	16.7
(Number)	(17)	(18)	(6)

TABLE XVII-53 (Cont'd)

d) by Occupational Status:

	Class Level of Occupation[a]							
	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII
Won't change	-	100.0	100.0	50.0	100.0	100.0	43.4	45.4
Undecided	-	-	-	-	-	-	13.0	18.1
Will change	-	-	-	50.0	-	-	43.4	36.3
(Number)	(0)	(1)	(1)	(2)	(9)	(3)	(23)	(11)

[a]Levels are: Professional; Semi-Professional; Managerial; Proprietorial; White Collar and Sales; Skilled; Semi and Unskilled; and Casual and Seasonal Labour.

e) by Kinship Relations:

	Number of Relatives Living in Toronto			
	Many	Several	1 or 2	None
Won't change	76.9	75.0	85.7	36.3
Undecided	0.0	12.5	14.3	13.6
Will change	23.1	12.5	0.0	50.0
(Number)	(13)	(8)	(7)	(22)

f) by Country of Origin

	Canada	U.S. and British Isles	Other (European)
Won't change	66.7	70.0	20.0
Undecided	6.7	10.0	30.0
Will change	26.7	20.0	40.0
(Number)	(30)	(10)	(10)

TABLE XVII-53 (Cont'd)

g) by Legitimation of the legal processes administering public drunkenness offenders.

	Accepts Legitimacy	Rejects Legitimacy
Won't change	38.4	72.7
Undecided	7.6	9.0
Will change	53.8	18.0
(Number)	(13)	(33)

h) by Disapproval of the legal agencies dealing with public drunkenness offenders.

	Disapproval of:		
	Police	Courts	Jail Authorities
Won't change	69.2	85.0	100.0
Undecided	11.5	5.0	0.0
Will change	19.2	10.0	0.0
(Number)	(26)	(20)	(9)

In answer to the question, "What effect has this experience, particularly the arrest, had on you? (Do you think it will change you in any way?)", the majority of respondents answered that their behaviour would not be substantially affected by the arrest. Some of their replies are given below:

Oh it might make me more cautious.

No effect. I don't think it will change my behaviour. It doesn't affect my job or create financial hardship.

They'll never get a chance to pick me up again. I'll keep clear of them.

I don't think so - part of the living scene. I didn't let it become personal. It might increase my disrespect for the law.....It's the periodic time to pick up some fines - that's the attitude. It's time to make a little money.

It's rather a shock to see all those men in one place, they're in such bad condition, they must have sordid lives - some of them. The average person doesn't see it.....You get sort of selfish, you don't realize some of the problems people have. It might change my drinking - I don't know. I don't think it's lasting. It takes a number of things to make one change, not just one thing.

It means another extra 5 days if I don't get the fine paid.....I don't like to be locked up, but there's nothing I can do about it.

What effect? None - I've nothing to be ashamed of.

I could say none whatsoever. I'll keep away from the downtown area and try not to get loaded again, but I'll still drink to the end, without stopping, if I start. Also, I'll try to keep my wits about me, and try to drink with someone else.

"None at all I guess." He feels, "I made a mistake and I paid for it." He says he tried to be careful that night but says he can't be more careful than he is. "It's more or less the district too." The cops watch more around where he lives and drinks. (Interviewer's account)

"The feeling of being so damned ashamed." He isn't proud of this, but feels it hasn't made him stop drinking. He feels he'll be more cautious in the future, but won't be changed by this in any way. (Interviewer's account)

Just one way. Next time I take a cab, I'll wait till I get to my destination before I pay. It's not gonna change my drinking.

It hasn't changed me in my thinking. Instead of walking up the street to a restaurant, I'll take a cab. It upset me more than anything else. I don't think it'll change me.

It had me puzzled, I was surprised, I didn't know what to think of it ... The arrest killed all my confidence in the police force.

Such an effect that I'll never go out to the beer parlour unless my wife is with me. And she won't leave before I do. I pray to God I never have that experience again.

It embarrassed me. But what I had to do was say, 'Just forget about it.' I'll just live my ordinary, normal life.

It make me so mad. No wonder it make me hate the police. If I had a gun, I shoot him. If I saw a policeman need help, I wouldn't help him.

He feels they made a mistake with him, feels they were prejudiced against him for being French. He wasn't drunk, doesn't know why he was picked up. He feels the police have so many to pick up as part of their job. "That's not too much, only five days." (Interviewer's account)

"Not a bit." He will get out next Tuesday, and will have a beer soon afterwards. He will carry on in exactly the same way, but will be more careful if he gets loaded, and will try hard to get a cab fast. (Interviewer's account)

As I told my wife, I've never felt so ashamed in all my life because of things I've seen in the cells. As far as I'm concerned, I don't think there's anything to change.

He says he'll think twice before leaving the hotel drunk again, and will probably take a taxi rather than walk. (Interviewer's account)

"You become a chicken when somebody bothers you." He feels it's given him the experience "of what it's like inside a cell". It won't change him. "I don't see any way at all that it could." (Interviewer's account)

> "A somewhat leavening one (i.e. experience)." He will "steer a wider path around these situations in the future". His drinking habits won't change, but he will be more careful of the police. (Interviewer's account)

All these responses are idiosyncratic and indicate highly variant interpretations of the crime, arrest and punishment. However most felt that they had not committed a crime or that if they had, it was one of little consequence - one that should not be on the law-books. A large number could not understand why they were arrested and seemed certain that the police were working on a quota system with respect to drunkenness offences - that is, a policeman's status or pay was enhanced by a greater number of arrests of drunkenness offenders. Most significant, the responses given above indicate rather definitely that an arrest for public drunkenness has little deterrent value for most first offenders. The socially and psychologically secure first offender will regard the arrest as a mistake, a shock, a bother - he may feel anger, remorse, or enlightenment about the "other half of the world" - but he will rarely see his public intoxication as criminal, as deserving of punishment or needing reform. At the very best, he will see the arrest of public drunkenness offenders as necessary to keep Skid Row drunks off the streets but he is unwilling to see any similarity between his own drinking behaviour and that of a C.D.O.

It is apparent from Tables XVII-54, XVII-55, XVII-56 that few first offenders and chronic offenders approved of their treatment by either the police or by the courts, but more were favourably disposed towards their treatment by the jail authorities.

We find (Table XVII-53) that disapproval of treatment by the police, courts, and jail authorities is strongly related to unwillingness to reform one's behaviour. This is to be expected since the main way in which an individual can retain a positive self-image after the degradations of arrest, trial and imprisonment is by forming a negative image of his captors and oppressors, and of "the law" or "the legal system" as well. Thus we find (Table XVII-53g) that an individual who rejects the legitimacy (i.e. validity or righteousness) of the "legal" processes" - the laws, the legal agencies and the whole ethos behind punishing for public drunkenness as it now stands - is much less likely to reform his behaviour than

is someone who accepts its legitimacy. In our sample a majority of individuals did reject the legitimacy of these laws and "legal processes". This denial of legitimacy varies directly with the individual's degree of social integration and the stability of his identification with one or another reference group, whether it be with the C.D.O. Skid Row society, or with the larger society. (Table XVII-57). Particularly interesting is the finding that those most acculturated to all-male, public group drinking (i.e. with "drinking buddies") are twice as likely to deny the legitimacy of the legal processes as those who drink alone. This is because, our hypothesis would suggest, the lone drinker is not well-integrated either into Skid Row society or into any sector of the larger society; as such he does not identify with any stable reference group (e.g. a regular drinking group) which would support his pride and self-image after arrest for public drunkenness. Therefore he does not question the legitimacy of the law.

TABLE XVII-54

ATTITUDE TOWARDS POLICE TREATMENT
(Per Cent)

	C.D.O.	F.O.		
		Age 50 and Under	Over 50	Total F.O.s
Approves	31.5	20.6	37.5	28.0
Ambivalent	4.4	23.5	6.25	16.0
Disapproves	62.6	53.0	50.0	52.0
No information	1.3	2.9	6.25	4.0
(Number)	(228)	(34)	(16)	(50)

TABLE XVII-55

ATTITUDE TOWARDS COURT TREATMENT

	C.D.O.	F.O.		
		Age 50 and Under	Over 50	Total F.O.s
Approves	15.4	38.3	62.5	46.0
Ambivalent	2.2	11.7	-	8.0
Disapproves	80.1	50.0	18.75	40.0
No information	2.3	-	18.75	6.0
(Number)	(228)	(34)	(16)	(50)

TABLE XVII-56

ATTITUDE TOWARDS TREATMENT BY JAIL AUTHORITIES

	C.D.O.	F.O.		
		Age 50 and Under	Over 50	Total F.O.s
Approves	78.4	47.0	25.0	40.0
Ambivalent	1.3	3.0	-	2.0
Disapproves	18.4	23.5	6.2	18.0
No information	1.9	26.5	68.8	40.0
(Number)	(228)	(34)	(16)	(50)

TABLE XVII-57

LEGITIMATION OF LEGAL PROCESSES, BY DEGREE OF SOCIAL INTEGRATION
(Per Cent)

a) by Marital Status

	Married	Single	Separated Divorced	Widowed
Accepts legitimacy	14.4	31.3	36.3	50.0
Rejects legitimacy	80.9	68.7	36.3	50.0
No information	4.7	-	27.3	-
(Number)	(21)	(16)	(11)	(2)

b) by Number of Relatives Living in Toronto

	Many	Several	1 or 2	None
Accepts legitimacy	25.0	12.5	12.5	36.5
Rejects legitimacy	75.0	87.5	75.0	50.0
No information	-	-	12.5	13.5
(Number)	(12)	(8)	(8)	(22)

c) by Country of Origin

	Canada	British Isles	Europe
Accepts legitimacy	16.1	30.0	55.6
Rejects legitimacy	77.5	60.0	33.3
No information	6.4	10.0	11.1
(Number)	(31)	(10)	(9)

TABLE XVII-57 (Cont'd)

d) by Customary Drinking Companions

	"Drinking Buddies" Acquaintances Strangers	Family, Close Friends	Alone
Accepts legitimacy	13.6	23.1	51.4
Rejects legitimacy	81.9	69.2	40.0
No information	4.5	7.7	8.6
(Number)	(22)	(13)	(15)

Another characteristic of the chronic offender which is relevant to an understanding of his generally deviant existence is his criminal behaviour, as exemplified by the record of convictions for offences other than public drunkenness. Such behaviour is sufficiently common among C.D.O.s that its presence may be used as an index of Skid Row integration. It is apparent from Table XVII-58 that the C.D.O.s showed a great deal of varied criminal activity during their lifetime, including more serious offences such as theft and assault as well as minor nuisance offences such as vagrancy and disturbing the peace. Significant in differentiating the two populations is the fact that the C.D.O.s had proportionately 5 times as many convictions for offences related to chronic drunkenness (such as a vagrancy, creating a disturbance, and B.L.C.A. offences[10]). This again would tend to indicate that relatively few first offenders are integrated into Skid Row living. Almost twice as many first offenders as chronic offenders had a "clear record", a sizeable distinction. On the other hand, the rate of criminality that appears in this first offender sample - 30 per cent with a recorded criminal conviction of some sort - is abnormally high, as compared with the overall Toronto population. We cannot say how representative it is of all first offenders.

[10]Breaches of the Liquor Control Act (Ontario).

TABLE XVII-58

CONVICTIONS FOR CRIMINAL OFFENCES
(Per Cent)

	C.D.O.	F.O.
i) Dominant Offence Category		
Theft, break and entry	38.9	8.0
Auto theft	0.7	2.0
Assault	8.4	4.0
Mixed record of offences	10.9	2.0
Other criminal offence	2.6	0.0
No criminal offence	38.2	70.0
(Number)	(285)	(50)
ii) Prevalence of Offences Related to Drinking		
Traffic offences	13.0	8.0
Non-traffic offences (B.L.C.A., vagrancy, etc.)	55.4	10.0
(Number)		

We have examined above the integration of first offenders into Skid Row society inferentially by studying the opportunities for interaction of F.O.s with C.D.O.s and other Skid Row citizens, and by examining the prevalence in the F.O. group of attitudes and activities which are characteristic of Skid Row society. Our assumption has been that, despite the existence of common needs deriving from addiction, isolation and deprivation, such unusual activities as the C.D.O.s' highly group-oriented leisure and drinking behaviour and their extensive criminal activity, together with such normative standards and attitudes as the ethic of reciprocity and their extreme unwillingness to reform could not be sustained without a high degree of social interaction and normative integration among them. We

discovered few first offenders integrated into Skid Row society, partly due to lack of opportunity for frequent interaction but also, as we have pointed out in the earlier discussion, due to a relatively less demanding set of personal problems (or vulnerabilities).

Age and First Offence

It was suggested earlier that many characteristics might tend to cluster within the first offender sample according to age level. The underlying question in our minds was, "Are these older first offenders like the younger ones in many or most ways, and are they more or less likely to become C.D.O.s?" To answer the last question first, it would appear from Table XVII-59 that there is rather little chance that they will become C.D.O.s. The age-distribution for C.D.O.s at the time of their first arrest for public drunkenness indicates that there is about one chance in 25 (3.9%) that a C.D.O. recruit will be over age 50 at the time of first arrest. That is not to say that this probability necessarily prevails in our first offender sample, since as we have repeatedly stressed, ours is a largely self-selected group and older offenders we believe are more responsive to being interviewed than younger ones. We base this assertion on the hypothesis examined throughout the course of the paper that socially isolated, marginal or vulnerable people are going to be more available, more honest about their own problems and more willing to express a desire to reform their behaviour, since they have the least to lose by so doing. Insofar as many of our "over 50" respondents are socially isolated and vulnerable, and insofar as in our society old age is generally associated with isolation, low status and insecurity, we are not surprised to see a large group of older first offenders selecting themselves for our sample.

It is nonetheless true that the probability of their recruitment into the chronic drunkenness offender population is rather low. The social vulnerability which disposed them to reveal themselves was not of the same type that moved the "under age 50" isolates to agree to an interview. Social isolation had been forced upon the former by age, by the dying or desertion of friends and spouses: they were not altogether personally responsible for their predicament. In contrast, the isolates under age 50 had largely brought isolation upon themselves although they were and had been in a position to prevent

TABLE XVII-59

AGE DISTRIBUTION OF DRUNKENNESS OFFENDERS
(Per Cent)

	C.D.O.		F.O.
Age	Present Age	Age at First Drunkenness Arrest	Present Age
Under 21	-	14.0	-
21 - 25	1.1	21.3	2.0
26 - 30	4.6	14.5	12.0
31 - 35	9.8	14.0	26.0
36 - 40	15.1	10.6	14.0
41 - 45	17.9	5.5	10.0
46 - 50	16.8	2.6	4.0
51 - 55	17.5	1.7	12.0
56 - 60	7.0	0.4	8.0
61 - 65	6.7	0.9	8.0
65+	3.5	0.9	4.0
(Number)	(285)	(235)	(50)
Mean age	46.3 years	30.0 years	42.7 years

or remedy it. For example, almost half the men under the age of 50 had never married while none of the men over 50 were in this category. More than half the men over the age of 50 were brought up outside Canada while fewer than 40 per cent of the younger group had such a background.

Similarly self selection would indicate that the older first offenders were disproportionately willing to talk about their drinking behaviour and their arrest but not for the same reasons as the vulnerable younger men. The older men had had a history of problem drinking just as severe as or more so than the younger first offenders but by the time of this study had either decreased their drinking or prevented it from increasing, so that they were found to be (proportionately) twice as often controlled drinkers. Their drinking had not made them socially isolated or vulnerable and they, unlike the younger drinkers, did not over-estimate the extent of their drinking problem. (This is stated in view of the finding that while the younger drinkers were twice as often uncontrolled, they were four times as likely to evaluate themselves as "heavy drinker" or "alcoholic".) They willingly revealed the extent of their past drinking for they had nothing to lose by so doing. The isolates under age 50 similarly had nothing to lose by revealing their drinking behaviour to the interviewer, but for many of them their drinking was apparently the central problem of their lives and so some may have tended to over-estimate its present extent.

If these older men are truly non-candidates for C.D.O. recruitment - as the one chance in 25 probability would suggest - why were they arrested? If we remember the structural conditions precipitating arrest, the vulnerability of the older person should be obvious. He is likely to be more visible and curiosity arousing. If he is walking, he will walk more slowly and perhaps less steadily than a younger man. He may have physical disabilities, and if he is living on a pension or part-time job, will be poorly dressed. In general, he is more likely to resemble the stereotype of the C.D.O. as an elderly derelict. Finally, he will probably be unaccompanied because of the social isolation often attached to advanced age. No interested person will be present to make him less visible, to inhibit curiosity-arousing behaviour or to guarantee his safety during intoxication. On the other hand, these vulnerabilities are somewhat compensated for by the fact that our older F.O. tends to engage in low visibility recreation - particularly in recreation which does not require associates. If his recreational pattern were more like that of the C.D.O.'s, we would assume he would be arrested much more often.

If we ask why these older men were not arrested for drunkenness at an early age - given that they have a past record of fairly heavy drinking - the answer would seem to be that the necessary conditions for arrest discussed above were not met. Most notably, these men

were by and large well integrated into primary and secondary groups in their younger days. They were less likely to be drinking in a public place or more likely to be accompanied by family or friends when drinking in public. They were earning a better living and were probably better dressed, busier, and more respectable-looking citizens. In short, they were "socially successful" to a greater extent than the majority of younger F.O.s and were later deprived of this success by old age and its concomitants - infirmity, retirement from work as the loss of status and income, death of friends and family, the loss of strength or will to find new friends or begin new adventures.

The major difference between the two first offender age groups is that the older group started with fewer advantages - for example, fewer had high school education, and fewer were born in Canada -, managed to hold a job and support a family for a long time if not for a life-time, and managed to hold in check a tendency towards addictive drinking. (Note that only one-third as many of the older F.O.s as the younger ones lost a job or lost time at work through their drinking.) These older men were, it would seem from this historical evidence, likely to be more stable and conscientious than the younger men. That is not to say that the younger men were not to some extent the victims of social conditions beyond their control which shaped their socio-economic vulnerability and ultimately their arrest for public drunkenness. We are pointing only to the facts that, given a similar background of drinking and social class origins, the older group had managed to stave off first drunkenness arrest for several decades while the younger group had not managed to do so. This would seem to indicate greatly dissimilar developmental or life patterns for the two groups, including perhaps different personality or motivational structures. We do not, regrettably, have the psychological data on first offenders with which to pursue this line of enquiry.

PREDICTIONS, VALIDATION AND RECONSIDERATIONS

We stated at the beginning of this chapter that we were concerned with predicting how many of our first offenders in this present sample were likely to become chronic drunkenness offenders. We attempted to do this by examining the prevalence among the first offenders of four constellations of variables which we indicated were almost universally characteristic of the C.D.O.s. This was done on the assumption that the presence of such factors indicated the vulnerability of such an individual for repeated arrest and thus his eligibility for C.D.O. group-membership.

To complete the aim of this task - namely, to predict those individuals in the first offenders sample who are specifically eligible and to calculate the proportion of first offenders who are likely candidates - we examined the social characteristics of each first offender and calculated how he rated on each of the four constellations, including problem drinking. We found (Table XVII-60) that, using a short-form model[11] of the C.D.O.'s characteristics (based on the four constellations introduced above), about 15 of out 50 first offenders demonstrated a high degree of eligibility for early recruitment into the ranks of the C.D.O.s. Regrettably we have no way of knowing exactly how biased our sample of first offenders is, and therefore cannot determine what the probability is of <u>any</u> first offender becoming a C.D.O. (If we were to predict such an event on the basis of our present estimates, the probability would be 0.30. This seems rather large in view of the present size of the known C.D.O. population and we are therefore forced to conclude that our sample, largely self selected and weighted in favour of those who were imprisoned, is a somewhat unrepresentative one as far as making blanket predictions about all first offenders is concerned).

---

[11] See the Appendix for information on the construction and use of this Short Form Model.

TABLE XVII-60

INDIVIDUAL VULNERABILITY RATINGS[a]

Sample Number	A[b] Problem Drinking	B[b] Social Isolation	C[b] Socio-Economic Vulnerability	D[b] Skid Row Integration	Social Vulnerability Rating (B,C,D)	Prediction Group[c]	Additional Arrests[d]
1	X	2	3	2	3	1	
2	X	3	3	2	3	1	1
3		3	1	3	3	2	2
4		1	1	2	2	4	
5	X	2	3	2	3	1	1
6	X	2	2	1	2	3	
7		1	2	1	2	4	
8		1	1	2	2	4	
9	X	2	1	3	2	3	1
10	X	3	3	3	3	1	2
11		1	1	2	2	4	
12		1	3	1	2	4	
13	X	3	3	2	3	1	1
14	X	1	1	2	2	3	
15		3	3	1	3	2	1
16	X	2	1	3	2	3	
17		2	2	1	2	4	
18	X	3	2	2	3	1	2
19		1	1	1	1	4	

TABLE XVII-60 (Cont'd)[a]

Sample Number	A[b] Problem Drinking	B[b] Social Isolation	C[b] Socio-Economic Vulnerability	D[b] Skid Row Integration	Social Vulnerability Rating (B,C,D)	Prediction Group[c]	Additional Arrests[d]
20	X	2	2	3	3	1	
21	X	2	1	2	2	3	1
22	X	2	2	3	3	1	
23	X	1	3	2	2	3	1
24	X	2	3	2	3	1	4 (C.D.O.)
25		3	3	3	3	2	
26		3	3	3	3	2	2
27	X	3	2	3	3	1	
28	X	2	2	2	2	3	
29	X	2	3	2	3	1	4 (C.D.O.)
30		2	3	3	3	2	8 (C.D.O.)
31		2	2	2	2	4	
32	X	2	1	3	2	3	1
33	X	1	1	1	1	3	
34		3	1	3	3	2	
35	X	2	2	3	3	1	
36	X	2	2	3	3	1	
37		3	2	3	3	2	

TABLE XVII-60 (Cont'd)[a]

Sample Number	A[b] Problem Drinking	B[b] Social Isolation	C[b] Socio-Economic Vulnerability	D[b] Skid Row Integration	Social Vulnerability Rating (B,C,D)	Prediction Group[c]	Additional Arrests[d]
38	X	2	1	2	2	3	
39		3	2	1	2	4	
40		2	2	3	3	2	1
41	X	3	3	3	3	1	1
42	X	1	1	2	2	3	
43		3	1	3	3	2	
44		1	1	3	2	4	
45		1	1	1	1	4	3
46		2	2	3	3	2	
47		2	1	2	2	4	1
48	X	1	2	2	2	3	
49		3	2	3	3	2	4 (C.D.O.)
50	X	3	3	2	3	1	

[a]Using Short Form prediction model, see Appendix for details.

[b]1 = low rating
2 = medium rating
3 = high rating

[c]1 = C.D.O. candidate
2 = Skid Row candidate
3 = Socially stable problem drinker
4 = Moderate drinking normal

[d]Those labelled C.D.O. had 3 arrests within a 12 month period.

Using our set of four social constellations, it is possible to typologize the individuals who made up our sample of fifty first offenders. Put in schematic form, it might appear as follows:- ("X" signifies high rating in the given constellation).

TABLE XVII-61

THE PREDICTION GROUPS: A TYPOLOGY

Type	Group	Number in Group	Problem Drinking	Social Dislocation	Socio-Economic Vulnerability	Skid Row Integration	Social Vulnerability[a]
Non-Normals	1	15	X	X	X	X	X
Non-Normals	2	11	-	X	X	X	X
Normals	3	12	X	-	-	-	-
			X	X	-	-	-
			X	-	X	-	-
Normals	4	12	-	-	X	-	-
			-	X	X	-	-
			-	X	-	-	-

[a]"Social Vulnerability" refers to the sum of the characteristics listed as part of the "social dislocation", "socio-economic vulnerability" and "Skid Row integration" constellations.

Group 1 are the C.D.O. "candidates" - problem drinkers who are socially isolated and socio-economically vulnerable, and are, to varying degrees, already showing symptoms of Skid Row and C.D.O. acculturation.

Group 2 are the Skid Row "candidates" - controlled and moderate drinkers who are socially isolated and socio-economically vulnerable, and are to varying degrees already acculturated to the Skid Row lifeways and integrated into Skid Row society.

Group 3 are the socially integrated and/or financially stable problem drinkers who, barring unforeseen social or financial change for the worse, will not be eligible for C.D.O. membership.

Group 4 are the temperate "normals" - lower and lower-middle class people without a drinking problem, who are socially integrated, who are no more socio-economically vulnerable than most other lower and lower-middle class people, and show no signs of integration into Skid Row society. They are the least likely to become C.D.O. recruits.

In spite of the present limitations of our sample this study does demonstrate that it is practically possible to make individual and group predictions (given a random sample of first offenders), making use of the four constellations of key variables developed above or, perhaps, of some other variables derived from a direct comparison of the first offenders with the known features of the C.D.O. population. It points to the feasibility of developing methods of diagnosis that could be used on the occasion of the first arrest to direct public inebriates to the appropriate treatment and welfare agencies.

Verifying the Predictions

Our predictions were tested by checking the recent police files on each of our 50 respondents. We looked to see which of our fifty first offenders had, in the intervening period of approximately four to four and a half years since their interview, been arrested again for public drunkenness. This is not a completely satisfactory verification of our hypotheses since we know that the interval between first arrest and entry into the revolving door pattern usually takes much longer than this. Further, we have only the criminal records for those convicted of drunkenness within Toronto. It is known that incipient C.D.O.s sometimes leave their home town for up to ten or twenty years in search of a "geographic cure" for their addiction and attendant social complications, returning to town only some time later as full-fledged C.D.O.s Our verification probably understates the subsequent drunkenness convictions of the C.D.O. candidates, and perhaps also the Skid Row candidates, since both samples are free to move because of their weak or absent ties to families and jobs.

However, while the police files cannot be used to validate with confidence our predictions about the "high" eligibility group directly for the reasons given above, they can do so indirectly, as follows. Contrary to our true beliefs, we hypothesize that the 50 persons in the first offender sample are randomized with respect to the probability of their being arrested within the intervening four-year period (1962-66). All 50 are equally likely to become C.D.O.s but not all of them can be expected to do so within the short period of 4 years. We then put forward the alternate hypothesis that all are not equally likely to become C.D.O.s, nor are the C.D.O. candidates all likely to be arrested again (in Toronto) within the 4-year period. The first hypothesis, our null hypothesis, states that there is no predictability achieved using the model we have constructed and states, more specifically, that any number from 0 to 50 of the first offenders may have become C.D.O.s between 1962-66.

The alternate hypothesis states that any number from 0 to 50 of the first offenders may have become C.D.O.s in the period 1962-66, but that the most likely range was between 0 and 15, the next most likely between 0 and 26. Further, the hypothesis states that whatever the number of first offenders becoming C.D.O.s by 1966, they are most likely to be drawn from the group designated as C.D.O. candidates, next most likely to be drawn from the overall group designated as "non-normals" and least likely to be drawn at random from the entire first offender group.

In actual fact we found the following on checking the police files on our 50 first offenders for the period 1962-66.

TABLE XVII-62

ADDITIONAL DRUNKENNESS OFFENCES BY THE FIRST OFFENDERS SINCE FIRST DRUNKENENESS OFFENCE
(Per Cent)

Number of Additional Arrests since First Drunkenness Arrest: 1962-66	Prediction Group			
	Temperate Normals(#4)	Intemperate Normals(3)	Skid Row Candidates(#2)	C.D.O. Candidates(#1)
None	83.4	66.7	45.4	46.7
One	8.8	33.3	18.2	26.6
Two or more	8.8	-	36.4	26.6
(Number)	(12)	(12)	(11)	(15)
Average Number of Additional Arrests (per person	.33	.33	1.64	1.07
Three Arrests in 12 Months (new C.D.O.s)	-	-	18.2	13.3

What is the significance of these findings? The data indicate that in the four years since the first offender group was interviewed four first offenders have gone on to become chronic offenders in the sense that they have been arrested three times in 12 months for public drunkenness - the operational definition of C.D.O. used in our study. Of these four new C.D.O.s, we had predicted two of them, the other two had been predicted as Skid Row candidates.

These results should not come as a surprise after the findings and the speculations in our discussion of arrests. We can explain the recruitment of the two men predicted as Skid Row candidates in terms of the prerequisites for arrest cited in that Section: these men were as visible, curiosity-arousing, and socially unaccompanied (or unprotected) as the C.D.O. candidates.

An Alternative Approach

Our approach in the construction of a predictive model of this paper was to examine the similarity of first offenders to the present problems and life styles of chronic offenders. We assumed that if there was a great similarity between a given F.O. and the C.D.O. characteristics, that F.O. would be not only vulnerable to repeated arrest, but would be also eligible and adaptable to the C.D.O. Skid Row lifeways which provide some facilities for people with drinking problems, problems of social isolation, and problems of financial insecurity.

An alternative approach is to examine and compare two first offender groups: the first offenders who are known to have gone on to become C.D.O.s, and first offenders whose fate is yet unknown. The former group is obtained by reconstructing time sequences in the C.D.O. life history, finding which situations occurred before, at roughly the same time, and definitely after the first arrest for drunkenness. Ignoring our previous conclusions regarding the conditions necessary for drunkenness arrest, we ask, "What is it about the C.D.O.s that got them arrested at the time of their first offence, and why did they continue to get arrested"? If we can answer that question for the C.D.O.s, we should be able to predict which first first offenders will become C.D.O.s.

As not enough of the data relevant to this purpose had been coded by age in the C.D.O. sample, we did the coding for a randomly selected subsample of the C.D.O. sample, a group of 50 C.D.O.s who we hoped would be representative of the total C.D.O. population. We find (Table XVII-63) that, using age distribution as an index of the similarity between groups, our C.D.O. subsample is very much representative of the entire C.D.O. sample. While there are some contrasts, the major distinguishing feature of the C.D.O.s, their youth at time of first drunkenness arrest, is well represented in the subsample: 4.0 per cent of the subsample as compared with 3.9 per cent of the entire sample was over 50 years of age at time of first arrest. The representativeness of the subsample is also indicated by the similarity of the "no information" categories for the two groups: the subsample, like its parent sample, has a "no information" rate of about 1 in 8 for "age at first arrest".

TABLE XVII-63

AGE AT TIME OF FIRST DRUNKENNESS OFFENCE
(Per Cent)

	Total C.D.O.	C.D.O. Subsample	First Offenders
Under 21	14.0	22.0	-
21 - 25	21.3	24.0	2.0
26 - 30	14.5	8.0	14.0
31 - 35	14.0	16.0	26.0
36 - 40	10.6	4.0	12.0
41 - 45	5.5	6.0	8.0
46 - 50	7.6	4.0	6.0
Over 50: 51 - 55	1.7	4.0	14.0
Over 50: 56 - 60	0.4	-	6.0
Over 50: 61 - 65	0.9	-	6.0
Over 50: 65+	0.9	-	6.0
No information	13.6	12.0	0.0
(Number)	(235)	(50)	(50)
Average Age	29.4	28.6	42.6

Table XVII-64[12] indicates that a majority of C.D.O.s were problem drinkers at the time of their first arrest for drunkenness. We cannot provide exact figures since the ages of occurrence of each of the problem

[12] In making these computations, we have departed from our usual pattern of calculating percentages, and have disregarded the "no information" group, using only those who gave definite responses as our base for the calculation of percentages. This is justifiable for the C.D.O. group, since this group unlike the first offenders was randomly selected, and we could therefore assume that the distribution of "no responses" was random. We have shown throughout this study that our sample of first offenders, on the other hand, is definitely not random, and we could show that this is similarly true of "no responses" on certain key types of questions for this group.

drinking symptoms tabulated were grouped in 5-year periods. However, we can say with assurance that at least 51.1 per cent of the C.D.O.s were drinking heavily before the period in which they were first arrested for drunkenness, while another 37.2 per cent began drinking heavily within that same period of first arrest, although we cannot say with any assurance that they had begun drinking heavily before the arrest itself. Thus the lower limit is 51.1 per cent who had definitely begun drinking heavily, and the upper limit is 88.3 per cent who may have been drinking heavily prior to the first arrest for drunkenness. At the same time it is interesting to note that one-eighth (11.7%) were definitely not drinking heavily prior to their arrest, and as many as 48.9 per cent - almost one-half - may not have been drinking heavily before their first arrest for drunkenness. About two-fifths of the chronic offenders were definitely not morning drinking at the time of their first arrest, and over one-half had definitely not lost control of their drinking; over one-half had never suffered from blackouts and more than two-thirds had never experienced the shakes prior to their first arrest for drunkenness (according to their own statements). These certain lower limits for a random sample of the C.D.O. population would suggest that problem drinking or its absence at time of first drunkenness arrest is not a reliable indication of C.D.O. eligibility.

It is possible to come somewhat closer to a true knowledge of the proportion of problem drinkers in the C.D.O. group at time of first arrest by means of estimation using a weighted average. Since the sequence of events is in doubt only when both the given symptom and the arrest occurred in the same five-year period, we can estimate the proportion of times the sequence was "symptom-arrest" as opposed to "arrest-symptom" in that period by examining the percentage occurrence of each sequence in other time periods. Using this method, we find that each of the following symptoms of problem drinking was estimated to occur prior to first arrest in the following percentage of cases: heavy drinking, 81.4; morning drinking, 32.3; loss of control, 37.1: blackouts, 31.3; shakes, 27.6; and DT's, 4.0 per cent. These estimates support our earlier statement that problem drinking is not a necessary precursor of C.D.O. eligibility or induction into Skid Row.

TABLE XVII-64

PROBLEM DRINKING HISTORY AT TIME OF FIRST DRUNKENNESS ARREST
(Per Cent)

Problem Drinking Symptoms	C.D.O. Subsample	First Offenders
Heavy drinking	51.1 - 88.3	42.0
Morning drinking	28.2 - 41.0	32.0
Loss of control	30.2 - 48.8	12.0
Blackout	24.3 - 46.9	44.0
Shakes	20.5 - 30.7	24.0
DT's	7.9 - 11.6	8.0
Treatment for drinking	0.0 - 4.5	14.0

It seems evident from Table XVII-64 that the C.D.O.s at the time of first arrest were not consistently more frequently problem drinkers than our own F.O. sample. The "loss of control" category is misleading since it indicates a great difference between the two groups that does not necessarily exist. First, "loss of control" for the F.O. group refers only to the present situation (since we do not have data on this symptom in the F.O.'s previous drinking history), while for the C.D.O. it takes in the entire period prior to first arrest. Second, because of the way the questions were phrased and the ways answered by first offenders, it is necessary to think in terms of two "loss of control" F.O. groups - one which always loses control and one which sometimes loses control. We cannot be certain how much these two categories overlap, nor how compatible they are with the "loss of control" category for C.D.O.s. For the F.O.s, we have (Table XVII-64) taken "loss of control" to include all those who went on sprees in the last year and/or those who report that they never or sometimes are unable to stop drinking as long as they have money in their pockets. For the C.D.O.s, the "loss of control" category represents an artificial or coding contruct of more questions and more precise questions on drinking which are combined for a final assessment. In short, the two categories may not be comparable, and in the context of the overall pattern of symptomatology for the two samples, the number of problem drinkers at first arrest is roughly the same for the two samples. Perhaps the only major and interesting contrast is that, among the C.D.O.s few or none had sought out treatment for problem drinking

prior to first drunkenness arrest, while among the first offenders, about one in seven had done so.

How reliable is social isolation as an indicator of eligibility? Table XVII-65 indicates that, according to the respondent's marital status at time of first arrest for drunkenness, few incipient C.D.O.s were socially integrated when first arrested. About three-quarters of the incipient C.D.O.s were not married or were not living with their spouses at the time of their first arrest. The majority of these men had never been married.

TABLE XVII-65

MARITAL STATUS AT TIME OF FIRST DRUNKENNESS ARREST
(Per Cent)

Marital Status	C.D.O. Subsample	First Offenders
Single (Never married)	48.0 - 58.0	32.0
Married and together	8.0 - 28.0	42.0
Separated, divorced, widowed	10.0 - 20.0	22.0
No information	14.0	4.0
(Number)	(50)	(50)

Socio-economic vulnerability and financial insecurity are somewhat inconclusive discriminators of eligibility for C.D.O. induction. At the time of first drunkenness arrest, many men had already reached their economic peak: some 38 - 50 per cent had already experienced their "best economic period" and 22 - 36 per cent had already experienced their first "rough economic period". Yet sizeable proportions (one-half to two-thirds) had not yet entered their highest paying job or left their highest occupational status, and the majority had not yet experienced chronic unemployment or begun a career of casual jobs. On the other hand, Table XVII-66 indicates that almost one-third were unemployed or doing casual work at the time of their first arrest; that very few had a "white collar" occupational status and of the "blue collar" workers, few were skilled.

TABLE XVII-66

OCCUPATIONAL STATUS AT TIME OF FIRST DRUNKENNESS ARREST
(Per Cent)

Occupational Status[a]	C.D.O. Subsample	First Offenders
Professional	-	-
Semi-professional	-	-
Proprietor, managerial, official	1.3	2.0
Clerical, Sales	3.1	10.0
Skilled	12.9	6.0
Semi-skilled	15.4	32.0
Unskilled	17.9	10.0
Service (protective and other service)	4.5	8.0
Unemployed, casual, spot jobs	32.6	32.0
No information	-	-
(Number)	(226)	(50)

[a]Refer to Rogoff Scale.

We saw earlier that it was not necessary to be a problem drinker to become arrested for public drunkenness, although being a problem drinker tended to facilitate the operation of those processes which did get people arrested - being in public, being visible, curiosity arousing, and socially unaccompanied. Problem drinking, as we indicated, was important as a stepping stone to social isolation and socio-economic vulnerability. Social isolation tended to make one drink in public places, and to make one thus visible to the police, and to increase

the probability of being unaccompanied on the way home, Socio-economic vulnerability tended to make one unusual in personal appearance and increased the likelihood that one would drink at a public place, especially a beverage room, frequented by drunkenness offenders, thus bringing oneself under greater police surveillance.

It is significant therefore that the major characteristic on which the chronic offenders were differentiated from the first offenders at time of first arrest was on degree of social isolation, as indicated by their lack of marital attachment. They were roughly the same as the F.O.s in frequency of problem drinking and socio-economic vulnerability. However, we might bear in mind one very important difference between the two groups: their age distributions.

The relation of age to first arrest was discussed above (pp. 94-97). It was argued that men over 50 years of age at the time of first arrest were not likely to become C.D.O.s. They tended to be arrested because they were highly vulnerable to arrest by virtue of the high visibility, lack of companionship, and other characteristics (p. 96, above) associated with old age. In short, older men ran the risk of drunkenness arrest to a greater extent than younger men, given the same extent of drinking. One might even say that the social structure is "stacked against" the older man where drunkenness arrest is concerned; that the older man is pushed into arrest, while the younger man has to push himself. The severity or unusual nature of the young man's social problems precipitating arrest - whether problem drinking, social isolation, or financial insecurity - must be equal to the older man's, and it is therefore highly likely that his psychological problem is much more severe. It is not surprising to find an isolated old man; however we have good cause to wonder about the social isolation of a younger man. Similarly, it is common for older men to be chronically unemployed or retired, or holding light or casual jobs; but the rarity of such occupational instability among younger men in the general population leads one to ask questions about the social or psychological shortcomings of the young individual who exhibits this behaviour.

What can we learn from this comparison of first offender groups? It is apparent that the chronic offenders were much more socially isolated at first arrest than the F.O.s and that they had become socially isolated at a younger average age. This is not meaningful as stated, since the two are not coherent groups, but collections of

individuals. What is suggested by the rate or group statistic is that virtually all of the C.D.O.s were under age 50 at the time of their first arrest. Insofar as their age did not make them structurally vulnerable some other predisposing social factor must have been responsible. We suggest that it was their uncommon degree of "voluntary" social isolation. These unmarried incipient C.D.O.s were first arrested largely because they were isolated, and they were isolated, we would surmise, because they were unable to maintain stable affective interpersonal relationships. This is probably true also of the less numerous younger men in the F.O. sample who were socially isolated. They are the group from which the C.D.O.s of the future will probably be selected.

While the occupational status, and overall financial insecurity of the first offenders and of the chronic offenders at time of first arrest are roughly the same, the C.D.O.s are suffering this state of affairs at an average age 13 years younger than the F.O.s. Now, this group statistic is again misleading, but it does underline a major difference between samples. In the F.O. sample, of the 16 men who were unemployed, retired, laid off or doing casual jobs, 10 were over 50 years of age.

This finding tends to suggest the social "normality" of the F.O. group: few young men are unemployed and those who were unemployed were old and often physically unemployable. In contrast, there were no such old persons in the C.D.O. sample at the time of first arrest: it is, in this sense, a clearly "pathological" group, for a third are unemployed or doing casual work and none of these, since young, ought "normally" to be in such a situation. This indicates that the C.D.O.s are abnormal in that they become financially or occupationally insecure at a relatively young age. It suggests that in predicting C.D.O. recruitment among F.O.s we ought to look for such instability among the younger men, just as we looked there for social isolation. Since it is among the younger men that such conditions can most readily be avoided, the occurrence of such conditions indicates a pathological social situation or individual psychopathology or some combination of the two.

In summary, this alternative approach has not contributed much that could not have been deduced from earlier discussions. Perhaps the only major contribution it has made is in corroborating the belief that

the absence of symptoms of problem drinking is not a good predictor (at the time of first arrest) of ineligibility for C.D.O. recruitment. Too little is known about the complex relationship between drinking, arrest, social isolation and financial instability to be able to state certainly which factors are the causes of the others. All we can state with any assurance at this point is that heavy drinking is not a necessary precondition for getting started on the road to C.D.O. recruitment, since it is not a necessary precondition for being arrested for drunkenness. On the other hand, social vulnerability is such a precondition.

Reconsiderations

The "social vulnerability" model in revealing its own strengths and weaknesses through prediction and validation has provided some insight into the problem of long-range diagnosis. First, we predicted 24 normals (12 temperate, 12 intemperate) and 26 Skid Row candidates (11 temperate, 15 intemperate), these corresponding to Groups 4 and 3, and Groups 2 and 1 respectively. The 24 normals produced no C.D.O.s. The 26 Skid Row candidates produced 4 C.D.O.s. The 24 normals produced 8 additional drunkenness offences in the intervening 4 years. The 26 Skid Row candidates produced 34 additional offences. In this respect our model was quite adequate to the task.

However, the failings of this model are also apparent. First, it is relatively difficult to differentiate non-alcoholic Skid Row candidates from alcoholic Skid Row candidates (i.e. C.D.O. candidates) using this model. It has been suggested that this may be due, on the one hand, to the social isolation and the Skid Row lifeway tendency to encourage heavy drinking even among those who have not formerly been heavy drinkers, and, on the other hand, to the possibility of Skid Row non-alcoholics being arrested and charged with public intoxication almost as frequently as C.D.O.s because of their visibility, etc. The preference of the police for using the more easily processed public intoxication charge rather than the vagrancy charge, adds to this vulnerability of Skid Row non-alcoholics.

However, there is a rather more serious criticism of this model. It in effect split the entire F.O. group into two groups of approximately equal size and required a prediction group of 26 non-normals to predict the C.D.O. recruitment of 4 non-normals. That is, only one non-normal in six became a C.D.O. as predicted in the intervening 4-year period. This may be largely due to the fact that the period is too short to test with confidence the prediction of a career pattern that takes many years to reach

fruition. In addition, some of the non-normals who failed to become C.D.O.s may have died, left Toronto, "gone straight", committed crimes for which they were imprisoned, or any number of other possibilities. We have no way of knowing how many, if any, were thus eliminated - and if so, according to what pattern these changes in personal situation were brought about. We know that human beings are capable of changing themselves and changing their social situation, but without social psychological theories and personality data to bolster our present sociological model, we cannot make any judgements about how many were likely to "pull themselves up by their bootstraps".

This brings us to the final criticism of this model. It is able to predict with fairly good accuracy but requires the following conditions be fulfilled:

1. No unforeseen change in social vulnerability,
2. No unforeseen change in drinking patterns.

It is a somewhat static model since it does not take into account the processes of either personality change or change of social roles: it bases its predictions of present roles and vulnerabilities, as if these social characteristics could never change. As we have pointed out many times in the course of this paper, a static structural model is inadequate for precise prediction, although it is obviously better than no model at all.

Without a detailed follow-up study covering a much larger interval, it is hard to say whether the present model over-estimated or under-estimated the number of actual candidates for C.D.O. recruitment. We predicted about a .30 recruitment rate in this sample of 50 men and only .13 were recruited in the 4-year interval. Since, in addition, this sample was not representative of all first offenders and probably was biased towards the most vulnerable portion of all first offenders, it is possible that even a rate as high as .30 under-estimated the true rate for this group of 50 men.

These problems could be rectified in various ways. One step would be to use the complete model for prediction instead of the short-form model used here. Another would be to consider alcohol addiction (at time of interview) to be of second-order importance compared to social vulnerability to arrest in predicting new C.D.O. recruits. More important for the perfection of this predictive structural model would be the employment of follow-up studies to determine how many wrong predictions were made by our model, where some predicted C.D.O.s disappeared to, and so on.

Further, a comparative survey of the social vulnerabilities and drinking behaviour of lower class "normals" (i.e. never arrested) would be useful to provide a control group against which to contrast the vulnerabilities and other characteristics of the first offenders and C.D.O.s.

It is suggested, however, that such a model as the one presented here could be used, with suitable revisions, in a questionnaire format to differentiate "problem" first offenders from "normal" first offenders. This might be of some advantage to courts or therapists (depending on the system) in deciding what type of punishment, therapy or aid might be most beneficial (or least detrimental). Nothing can be gained either by society or by the individual in convicting, punishing, and in effect "labelling" a normal for public drunkenness. It is a stigmatizing treatment which may negatively affect the individual's social relations, self-respect, and financial well-being. For the first offender identified as having recidivist tendencies, improved rehabilitation or preventative treatment should be provided. A punishment of 5 days in jail or a $10 fine appears to have no rehabilitative value whatever and may accelerate induction into Skid Row.

As one respondent viewed the situation:

> I don't think jail is a deterrent, not in my case anyway. If you haven't the $10, it could be a hardship. Not in my case. If a person is making a nuisance of himself, damaging property, molesting people,he should be arrested. If he's not being a nuisance and can talk reasonably he should be sent home. The $10 is not going to make any difference. You're not going to prove anything like that.

We began this paper by stating our objectives to be an examination of the C.D.O. recruitment process and an examination of the characteristics predisposing individuals to recruitment. We have, by explicitly ignoring personality characteristics, come to see our two objectives as identical - that is, to see the recruitment process as an involuntary set of experiences, notably of unexpected arrests, depending solely on social vulnerability characteristics. There are too many different routes or sequences by which people become socially

vulnerable to allow us to specify such patterns at present; at the most general level, we can say that such people somehow become socially isolated, financially insecure and acculturated to the highly public Skid Row lifeways. Further, they may initiate or develop alcohol addiction, which in turn serves to aggravate one's degree of social vulnerability. There is no doubt a complex interrelationship between social vulnerability and addiction - one through which these two elements interact in some patterned sequence to propel the individual downward in the social structure: the "revolving door" syndrome.

There is much research yet to be done before a complete picture of the recruitment processes can emerge. More work must be done on the psychological aspects of addiction; on the psychological concomitants of social isolation and general insecurity. More work must be done on the structural aspects of arrest; on the social effects of "labelling" or stigmatizing; on the structural difficulties involved in decreasing one's social vulnerability (given age, education, social class, etc.). Finally more work must be done on the social-psychological problem of self-conception: how self-conception relates to reform of behaviour; how it is affected by arrest, labelling, and social insecurity; and alternately how it can be affected by various types of therapy and social relocation. Only through the integration of sociological and psychological perspectives in the realm of addiction and criminology will a comprehensive picture of C.D.O. recruitment emerge. Moreover, it is expected that this fuller picture will carry implications not only for our theoretical understanding of deviant behaviour, but also for the reform of therapeutic techniques and legal and administrative procedures in dealing with drunkenness offenders.

APPENDIX

THE SHORT FORM PREDICTION MODEL

Since it would have been difficult without the use of a computer and complex computer programming to have employed the four constellations in full (as introduced above) as a model for predicting "candidacy" for C.D.O. membership, it was necessary to devise a shorter although less adequate form of this model for the sake of immediate prediction. In this short form model each of the four constellations is investigated by the use of several representative variables. A rating scale is established which, by assigning arbitrary absolute values, allows us to determine relative degrees of eligibility for C.D.O. membership, Skid Row membership, and so on. While this short form model is less likely to be accurate in prediction than the full model because of its more limited ability to make subtle discriminations, it should provide us with a reasonable classification of the first offender sample population and some ability to make reasonable predictions about their future condition.

1. Problem Drinking Constellation

We rated as "problem drinkers" all those who, according to their own statements, manifested one or both symptoms of alcohol addiction:

a) were not always in control of the amount of alcoholic beverage consumed at one sitting, or the amount of money spent at one sitting,

b) had been on a drinking spree in the past year (i.e. continuous drinking for more than one day).

2. Social Isolation Constellation

The first offender was rated on social isolation on the basis of six variables and is given no points for each of the following responses:

a) Marital status - married

b) Friendships - having one or more close friends in Toronto

c) Friendship relations - seeing close friends once a week or more often

d) Kinship - having one or more relatives in Toronto

e) Kinship relations - seeing relatives once a week or more often

f) Country of birth - born outside Canada

A negative response on variable (a) was assigned a value of 2 points, while negative responses on the remaining variables were assigned values of 1 point each. The respondent's social dislocation was determined by summing the number of appropriate responses to a possible total score of 7 points.

SCORE CONVERSION TABLE

Social Isolation	C.D.O. Eligibility Rating
0, 1, or 2 points	Low eligibility - 1 point
3 or 4 points	Medium eligibility - 2 points
5, 6, or 7 points	High eligibility - 3 points

3. Socio-Economic Vulnerability Constellation

The first offender was rated on socio-economic vulnerability on the basis of six variables and was given no points for each of the following responses:

a)	Present employment status	- employed
b)	Education attainment	- grade 9 or higher
c)	Occupational status	- skilled or white collar worker
d)	Occupational stability	- no more than three different employers in last ten years
e)	Financial security	- has bank account
f)	Financial security	- could pay fine immediately (no "time to pay" required; no prison commitment, etc.)

A negative response on each variable was assigned a value of 1 point and the respondent's socio-economic vulnerability was determined by summing the number of appropriate responses to a possible total score of six points.

SCORE CONVERSION TABLE

Socio-Economic Vulnerability Score	C.D.O. Eligibility Rating	
0, 1, or 2 points	Low eligibility	- 1 point
3 or 4 points	Medium eligibility	- 2 points
5 or 6 points	High eligibility	- 3 points

4. Integration into Skid Row Society Constellation

The first offender is rated on his Skid Row socialization on the basis of eight variables and is given no points for each of the following responses:

a) Address	-	not in a census tract marked by an unusual proportion of C.D.O.s
b) Drinking companions	-	drink alone, with family, or with close friends
c) Residence	-	with marital or parental family
d) Effect of arrest	-	willing (according to his statements) to change drinking behaviour as a result of arrest.
e) Leisure activities	-	involve cost
f) Leisure activities	-	involve membership
g) Leisure activities	-	involve associates
h) Leisure activities	-	involve physical activity (e.g. sports)

A negative response on each variable was assigned a value of 1 point and the respondent's degree of Skid Row socialization determined by summing the number of appropriate responses to a possible score of 8 points.

SCORE CONVERSION TABLE

Skid Row Integration Score	C.D.O. Eligibility Rating	
0, 1, or 2 points	Low eligibility	- 1 point
3, 4 or 5 points	Medium eligibility	- 2 points
6, 7 or 8 points	High eligibility	- 3 points

Determination of Candidacy

Of the four constellations discussed above, problem drinking is (almost by definition) the main prerequisite for C.D.O. membership and therefore every candidate for C.D.O. membership was required to demonstrate high eligibility on this count to be considered a highly eligible candidate for C.D.O. membership overall.

The final method of determining candidacy to C.D.O. membership was as follows:

1. The "eligibility rating" scores for the social isolation socio-economic vulnerability and Skid Row integration constellations were summed. A total value of 7, 8, or 9 "C.D.O. eligibility rating" points indicates high "social vulnerability".

2. The appropriate prediction group was then obtained from the following typology:

		Social Vulnerability	
		High	Low
Problem Drinking	Present	C.D.O. candidate	Intemperate normal
Problem Drinking	Absent	Skid Row candidate	Temperate normal

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Bacon, S., "Inebriety, Social Integration and Marriage," Quarterly Journal of Studies on Alcohol 5: 303-339, 1944.

2. Blane,H., Overton, W. and Chafetz, M., "Social Factors in the Diagnosis of Alcoholism: 1. Characteristics of the Patient," Quarterly Journal of Studies on Alcohol 24: 640-663, 1963.

3. Carpenter, J.A., "Effects of Alcohol on Psychological Processes," in Fox, B.H. and Fox, J.H. (eds.) Alcohol and Traffic Safety (Washington: Public Health Service Publication #1043, 1963.)

4. Clinard, M., "The Public Drinking House and Society", in Pittman, D.J. and Snyder, C.R. Society, Culture and Drinking Patterns (New York: Wiley, 1962.)

5. Dollard, J., "Drinking Mores of the Social Classes," Alcohol, Science and Society (New Haven: Journal of Studies on Alcohol, 1945.)

6. Dubrowski, K., "Alcohol Determination - Some Physiological and Metabolic Considerations," in Fox, B.H. and Fox. J.H. (eds.) Alcohol and Traffic Safety (Washington: Public Health Service Publication #1043, 1963.)

7. Eggleton, M.G., "Psychological Tests and Blood Alcohol Level," Alcohol and Road Traffic - 1953 (Toronto: Garden City Press Co-operative Ltd., 1955.)

8. Ferguson, J.K.W., and Bell, R.G., "The Computation of Concentration of Alcohol in the Blood as a Function of Intake, Body Weight, and Time," Alcohol and Road Traffic - 1953 (Toronto: Garden City Press Co-operative Ltd., 1955.)

9. Forrester, G.C., Chemical Tests for Alcohol in Traffic Law Enforcement (Springfield, Ill.: Charles C. Thomas, 1950.)

10. Gottleib, D., "The Neighbourhood Tavern and the Cocktail Lounge: A Study of Class Differences," American Journal of Sociology 62, 559-562, 1955

11. Haer, J.L., "Drinking Patterns and the Influence of Friends and Family," Quarterly Journal of Studies on Alcohol 16, 178-185, 1955.

12. Lawrence, J.J. and Maxwell, M., "Drinking and Socio-Economic Status," in Pittman, D.J. and Snyder, C.R. Society, Culture and Drinking Patterns (New York: Wiley, 1962.)

13. McKinley, D.G., Social Class and Family Life (Glencoe, Ill.; Free Press, 1964.)

14. Pittman, D.J. and Gordon, C., Revolving Door: A Study of the Chronic Police Case Inebriate (Glencoe, Ill.; Free Press, 1958.)

15. Singer, E., Blane, H. and Kasschau, R., "Alcoholism and Social Isolation," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology 69, 681-685, 1964.

16. Stone, G.P., "Drinking Styles and Status Arrangements," in Pittman, D.J. and Snyder, C.R., Society, Culture and Drinking Patterns (New York: Wiley, 1962.)

17. Strauss, R. and Bacon, S., "Alcoholism and Social Stability: A Study of Occupational Integration in 2,023 Male Clinic Patients," Quarterly Journal of Studies on Alcohol 12, 231-260, 1951.

18. Ullman, A., "Sociocultural Backgrounds of Alcoholism," Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science 315, 48-54, 1958.

19. Wellman, W., Maxwell, M., and O'Halloren, P., "Private Hospital Alcoholic Patients and the Changing Conception of the Typical Alcoholic," Quarterly Journal of Studies on Alcohol 18, 388-404, 1957.

APPENDIX

THE CHRONIC DRUNKENNESS OFFENDER

Research Reports

1. Introduction: Methodology and Summary of Findings
2. The Law and Law Enforcement
3. Dimensions of the Problem
4. Statistical Profile of Offenders
5. The Courts
6. The Prison
7. Life on Skid Row
8. Family Background
9. Education and Work
10. Criminal Careers
11. Drinking Histories
12. Physical Health
13. Ages and Causes of Death
14. Psychological Test Findings
15. Psychiatric Assessment
16. History of Treatment for Alcoholism
17. First Offenders: A Comparison
18. Survey of Treatment and Rehabilitation Facilities
19. Recommendations

Supplement A. Typical Case Histories

Date Due

NOV 1 2 1978

DEC 1 2 1978

MAR 8 1979

APR 8 1980

MAR 12 1981

MAR 1 2 1981

APR 1 1 1981

MAR 2 2 1982

JUN 1 7 1991

RM 109

PLEASE DO NOT REMOVE
CARDS OR SLIPS FROM THIS POCKET

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO LIBRARY

HV
5309
O5G5
v. 17

CRIM.

Alcoholism and Drug Addiction Research Foundation of Ontario
The chronic drunkenness offender, chapter XVII

2

UTL AT DOWNSVIEW
D RANGE BAY SHLF POS ITEM C
39 08 26 08 06 017 7